DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 332 443 EC 300 305

AUTHOR Snow, Gary D.; And Others
TITLE Northwest ESD 189 Special Education Equity Project: July 1, 1989 to June 30, 1990. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Washington Research Inst., Seattle.
SPONS AGENCY Washington Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Olympia.
PUB DATE Dec 90
NOTE 119p.; The appended interview summaries contain small type.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; American Indian Education; Biculturalism; *Bilingual Education; Bilingual Students; *Cultural Differences; Educational Practices; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Migrant Education; Minority Groups; Parent Attitudes; Parent Participation; Preservice Teacher Education; Special Education; *Special Needs Students; Student Evaluation; Student Placement; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Backward Mapping; *Northwest Educational Service District 189 WA

ABSTRACT

This study examined special education services for migrant and Native American students in Washington's Northwest Educational Service District 189, an area of 35 school districts with 33% of the enrollment comprising these two minority groups. The study used a backward mapping approach as it sought to identify best practices/procedures and problems that families and school staff perceived in programs for these two groups. Fifty-four people were interviewed, including representatives of nine school districts, parents, and community agency representatives. In the interviews, concerns were expressed about: (1) screening and assessment of bilingual students (including the use of interpreters in test administration, inadequate training for interpreters); (2) parental involvement (obtaining informed consent for assessment, individualized education program approval); (3) placement options (lack of bilingual programs, lack of vocational programs, over-referral to special education); and (4) other issues such as drop-out rates, attendance, cultural awareness, funding, communication between tribes and schools, substance abuse, fetal alcohol syndrome, and teenage pregnancy. Appendices present recommendations relating to inservice training in assessment, and preservice training of bilingual/bicultural and Native American staff; special education placement rates by district; a bibliography of over 100 items; a list of other bibliographies and other resources; and interview summaries. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED332443

Washington Research Institute, 180 Nickerson Street, Suite 103, Seattle, WA 98109

Final Report

December, 1990

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Northwest ESD 189

Special Education Equity Project

July 1, 1989 to June 30, 1990

Project Director
Gary D. Snow, Ph.D., Director,
Special Programs and Services
Northwest ESD 189

Conducted by:
The Washington Research Institute

Marcia Davidson
Mary Maddox
Patricia Vadasy

FC300-305

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Patricia Vadasy
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This study was conducted with funding from the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and no official endorsement by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction should be inferred.

Acknowledgments

The staff at the Washington Research Institute would like to thank all of the district staff, parents, and tribal, migrant, and community representatives who gave their time to participate in these interviews. We want to thank the Advisory Board members for their participation. We especially want to thank Gary Snow and Marguerite McLean for their roles in initiating, nurturing, and guiding this study, and Gene Edgar for lending his skills and support and his generous consultations from the planning to the dissemination and spin-off phases of this project.

Table of Contents

Page

Acknowledgments

Executive Summary i

Introduction and Background to the Study 1

How the Study was Conducted 3

Results 8

Recommendations 22

Footnotes 30

Appendices

A. Summary of Recommendations for Consideration by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
B. Special Education Placement Rates by District
C. Bibliography
D. Interview Summaries

Executive Summary

Introduction

This study examined special education services for migrant and Native American students in Northwest ESD 189. Both of these groups of children have been inappropriately identified for special education services. In some cases, students who have special needs have not been referred to special education. In other cases, these students have been overreferred to special education. In addition, appropriate placement options (e.g., bilingual programs) are not always available for these students.

The purpose of this study was to identify best practices and procedures, and problems that families and school staff perceived in programs for these two groups, which comprise up to 33% of district enrollment. The results of the study will be used to develop guidelines and policy recommendations that will insure equity of educational opportunities for these two groups of students.

This study was conducted by the Northwest ESD 189 and the Washington Research Institute (WRI). An Advisory Board made up of representatives from Northwest ESD 189, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Lummi tribe, and participating school districts guided the study. Support for the study was obtained from the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

How the Study was Conducted

This study was conducted using a backward mapping approach. The process begins by describing concrete behaviors and problems that require a policy intervention. After careful analysis at the service delivery level of behaviors and problems, recommendations that are most likely to affect service delivery can be made. Most policy implementation is done using a forward mapping strategy which assumes that policy makers control the procedures that affect implementation. Backward mapping was selected because it results in realistic policies which are based on what actually happens at the point where services and clients interact.

Key individuals in the area were interviewed in order to identify problems and solutions with regard to providing special education services to migrant and Native American students. Participants included representatives of nine school districts (administrators, teachers, instructional assistants), parents, and community agencies. A total of 54 people were interviewed. Project staff obtained key informants' responses to a common set of questions developed by the Advisory Board. The interview included specific questions about screening and assessment, placement, parental involvement, and an open-ended question about general problems and their solutions.

Interview responses were summarized and recommendations were made in a final report. School district incidence data for minority representation in special education were collected. In addition, a comprehensive review of the literature was conducted and assembled in a bibliography.

Results

Assessment. The screening and assessment of bilingual students were perceived as problem areas. Respondent concerns were: the use of interpreters and instructional assistants in test administration; tests to establish language proficiency were not always given in both languages; interpreters were not always literate in the language of the tests; training for interpreters was not always adequate.

Training for special education staff in appropriate procedures for assessing bilingual and Native American students was perceived as a critical need. The difficulties of using standardized test data to qualify these students for special education was recognized. A need for a formal process for ruling out the influence of cultural, environmental, and economic factors was expressed. Instances of overreferral and underreferral were cited. Ultimately, placement decisions took into account what programs were available and appropriate within both regular and special education. While the need for "special interventions" was great, the non-special education resources available were sparse.

Parent Involvement. Parental involvement in educational programs for both migrant and Native American students was regarded as a problem area. Concerns were expressed about procedures used to obtain informed consent for assessment, IEP approval, and general parent involvement. School district personnel were frustrated and frequently unsuccessful in efforts to obtain meaningful parent involvement. Parents and advocates were concerned about school district methods, e.g., using migrant home visitors as "messengers" for special education due process forms, and mailing due process forms.

Districts expended a great deal of effort to include parents in IEP meetings. Many districts made accommodations, like providing transportation. Teachers and parents agreed, however, that simply attending an IEP meeting did not constitute parental involvement. Concern was expressed that parents were not encouraged to be involved: their requests were frequently ignored. Distrust between schools and parents was common.

Placement Options. Appropriate programs and services for bilingual and Native American students was seen by many as lacking. When appropriate, non-special education programs were available, overreferral to special education was less of a problem. In the absence of alternative program options, special education was often selected by default.

In regard to migrant students, a lack of bilingual programs was seen a serious problem. For Native American students, appropriate secondary programs, with a vocational or life skills orientation, were needed.

Other Issues. Several other major issues were frequently identified by participants. These included:

- Drop-out rates, attendance and absences
- Cultural awareness
- Funding
- Communication between tribes and schools
- Substance abuse, fetal alcohol syndrome, teenage pregnancy

Recommendations

A series of recommendations were developed based on the interview findings. These recommendations reflect and expand on exemplary practices found in the participating districts and described in the literature.

Recommendations for Districts Serving Migrant/Bilingual and Native American Students

Parent Involvement. School districts need to carefully examine their policies for obtaining informed consent for assessment and IEPs. It was also recommended that districts conduct internal reviews of parent involvement and due process practices to assure compliance with the law. The practice of sending migrant home visitors and Native American liaisons as "messengers" for informed consent and IEP sign-offs needs to be reviewed. Accommodations to help parents attend meetings at school need to be made.

Assessment. Training for assessment staff in aspects of Native American and Hispanic cultures that may affect assessment results and interpretation should be provided.

Administration. Incidence data on migrant and Native American children in special education should be collected and reviewed annually. In addition, systems for assessing the size of the drop-out problem and for monitoring the status of drop-outs need to be put into place.

Drop-out Prevention. Drop-out prevention efforts need to be implemented beginning at the elementary level. Program options and scheduling for secondary students need to be scrutinized in consultation with tribal leadership and migrant/bilingual representatives to assure that they meet students' academic, vocational, and life skills needs.

Cultural Awareness. New teachers should receive cultural awareness training. Schools should create a learning environment that respects and supports the cultures of minority students.

Recruiting Trained Personnel. There should be an ESD-wide effort to recruit Spanish speaking and Native American teachers. Consideration should be given to developing a career ladder for local Hispanic and Native American paraprofessionals to provide them with on-site training that leads to a teaching credential.

Recommendations for Districts Serving Migrant Students

Assessment. Training for assessment and screening personnel is needed. Staff should be trained specifically in the use and interpretation of standardized tests and screening instruments with children of different cultures, as well as in report writing. The use of interpreters in the assessment and screening process needs to be reviewed and clarified.

Guidelines need to be developed in cooperation with OSPI for the training of assessment personnel working with large numbers of migrant students. In addition, guidelines regarding the assessment of preschool students with limited English proficiency should be developed.

Program Options. Bilingual and structured immersion programs need to be available to migrant children in both regular and special education. In order to distinguish learning disabled children from children who have limited English proficiency or who are in transition from Spanish to English, opportunities for bilingual instruction need to be provided outside of special education.

Administration. State guidelines need to be established to clarify the distinctions between ESL, migrant, bilingual and other programs serving non-English speaking children to assure that non-migrant bilingual children are receiving services. In addition, district-level policies regarding the use and updating of MSRTS data need to be developed.

Clerical support and other supports need to be provided to bilingual staff in order to reduce the amount of time these teachers spend on clerical and administrative activities.

Recommendations for Districts Serving Native American Students

Communication. Thoughtful and consistent efforts are needed to improve the communication and working relationship between tribal leadership and the schools. Where they exist, Native American educational liaisons should be viewed as members of the educational team and used to foster positive relationships between tribal members and the schools.

Parents. Preschool programs, including birth to 3, for Native American handicapped and non-handicapped children should be used as an opportunity to stimulate and build parent involvement.

Program Options. Schools need to explore the use of Native American tutoring programs for handicapped and non-handicapped students as a means of promoting cultural self-awareness, interaction among Native American students, and drug/alcohol awareness programs, as well as a means to provide educational support.

Conclusion

Summarizing the findings from this project was a difficult undertaking. Pages of interview transcripts were condensed and analyzed. It is impossible in this short summary to present all of the data that formed the basis for these recommendations. It is equally difficult to accurately portray the commitment and concern of the individuals involved in providing this information. While the focus of this report is on problems that need solving, it should be noted that many of the recommendations were drawn from the solutions already in place.

Complete copies of this report are available from the Washington Research Institute, 180 Nickerson Street, Suite 103, Seattle, WA 98109.

Introduction and Background to the Study

Two minority groups of students, children of migrant laborers and children of Native American origin, have often been inappropriately identified for special education services. In some cases, students in these populations who have special needs have not received appropriate services. In other cases, these students have been overreferred for special education. The purpose of this study was to identify best practices and procedures, and problems that families and school staff were experiencing in providing programs for these students. This information from the school districts would then be used to develop guidelines and policy recommendations for best practices to insure equity of educational opportunities for these two groups of students.

In this country, ethnic group membership has been highly significant in determining the environmental circumstances in which children grow and develop (Laosa, 1984). The major educational policy initiatives from the 1960-1980 era-- such as Head Start, Title I, and Follow Through-- focussed on achieving equity of opportunity for all children.

Legislative and judicial action from this period has had a significant influence on the policies for the educational assessment and placement of ethnic, racial, and language minority children. P.L. 94-142, for example, provided that testing and evaluation materials must be selected and administered so as not to be racially or culturally discriminatory, and must be conducted in the child's native language. P.L. 90-247 (1968), the Bilingual Education Act, provided financial assistance for districts to provide bilingual instruction to children of limited English proficiency, and P.L. 89-10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 made funds available for the education of the disadvantaged and handicapped.

The judicial decisions regarding the landmark cases Diana v. California State Board of Education (1970) and Larry P. v. Riles (1971) have directed districts to reduce reliance on scores of IQ tests administered in English for placement decisions of children from predominantly non-English speaking homes, and have increased pressure for testers fluent in the child's native language. The U.S. Supreme Court's decision in Lau v. Nichols (1974) extended the definition of equal educational opportunity to include the rights of limited English speaking students.

The question we face in 1990 is how these policies regarding educational assessment and placement have been translated into school district procedures for serving minorities. The focus of this study is two often overlooked minority groups in Washington State-- migrants and Native Americans-- and the setting is Northwest ESD 189 where these students account for up to 33% of district enrollment.

The Backward Mapping Process

This study takes the form of naturalistic inquiry. In conventional inquiry, researchers begin with a theory which they attempt to prove or disprove through the collection and analysis of data. In contrast, naturalistic inquiry begins by sampling data, taking observations, describing patterns, and developing a set of propositions or findings that derive from the cases, and that translate into policies.

The particular qualitative research approach used in the study is known as backward mapping (Elmore, 1980). Most research on policy implementation uses a forward mapping strategy, and begins with a clear statement of the policy intent or objective-- for example, a policy for the placement of migrant students in special education-- and then describes the specific steps needed to achieve that objective.

The major weakness of forward mapping is the assumption that policy makers control the procedures that affect implementation. As Elmore (1980) observes, "forward mapping reinforces the myth that implementation is controlled from the top."

Backward mapping is based on the assumption that the closer one looks at the areas where an administrative decision interacts with individual actions, the better one can formulate objectives that in fact have a chance at influencing policy. Backward mapping begins by describing concrete behaviors and problems that require a policy intervention. Through analysis of these behaviors, the researcher is able to recommend the resources that are most likely to affect service delivery.

In this backward mapping study, we began by talking to the individuals in the school districts who were most likely to be familiar with the educational placement of migrant and Native American students, and to have thought about the process, its successes and failures. We expected that these informants would include special education teachers, assessment personnel, parents, and special education administrators.

The Northwest Educational Service District 189 includes 35 school districts. The project's Advisory Board of state, regional, and local experts in migrant and Native American education selected 9 districts that would best represent the region as interview sites. The Advisory Board also assisted in identifying key informants within the districts, and in formulating the list of questions that would be asked in each interview.

How the Study was Conducted

In the summer of 1989, Gary Snow, Director of Special Programs and Services, Northwest ESD 189, met with staff of the Washington Research Institute to outline this study. A proposal developed jointly by Washington Research Institute (WRI) and Northwest ESD 189 was submitted to the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction by Dr. Snow, and was funded. Project staff were Gary Snow, Director, and the following WRI staff: Marcia Davidson and Patricia Vadasy, Co-Directors, and Mary Maddox, Project Associate.

In order to determine district experiences and successes in serving Native American and migrant students and their families, the following activities were proposed:

1. Organize an Advisory Board, with membership representing state-level migrant and Indian education, tribal organizations, migrant groups, and regional special education personnel. The Advisory Board's role was to provide the interview questions; to assist in identifying the study's key informants (the persons most familiar with the educational needs and experiences of these two groups); and to review the interview responses, data analysis, and recommendations.

2. Interview administrators, teachers, related services providers, parents, advocates, and community providers to obtain their perceptions of current practices, problems, successes, perceived needs, and potential solutions.

3. Analyze and summarize data from the interviews.

4. Obtain incidence data from the targeted school districts on the proportions of Native American and migrant students in the districts, and the rates of placement for these students in special education.

5. Review the literature on special education programs, policies, and promising models for migrant and Native American students.

6. Prepare a report of the findings and recommendations for review by the Advisory Board and dissemination.

7. Submit recommendations for a federal grant application to support implementation of study recommendations.

Advisory Board

The following individuals accepted invitations to serve on the project's Advisory Board:

Gary Snow, Director of Special Programs and Services, Northwest ESD 189

Marguerite McLean, Coordinator, Migrant Handicapped/Bilingual Handicapped, Curriculum, Instructional Support and Special Education Programs, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction

Keith Crosbie, former Bilingual Education Coordinator, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction

Willard Bill, former Equity Education and Indian Education Supervisor, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction

William Jones, Lummi tribe representative, Bellingham

Mary Kirkwood, Director of Special Education, LaConner School District

Maria Day, Coordinator of Compensatory Programs, Burlington

Andrew Rodarte, Director of Western Migrant Education Center, Northwest ESD 189

The Advisory Board met in December, 1989 to identify critical concerns regarding the education of migrant and Native American students and their special education assessment and placement; to generate questions to address those concerns; to identify the school districts in which interviews will be conducted; and to identify key informants who should be interviewed for the study.

The Board selected 4 districts in which to conduct interviews on migrant issues, and 5 districts for interviews on Native American issues; within each district 5-6 interviews would be conducted, half with school district staff, and half with non-district informants.

The districts selected for sampling through the informant interviews were:

Native American	Migrant
Ferndale/Bellingham	Lynden
Darrington	Mt. Vernon
LaConner	Burlington
Marysville	Sedro-Woolley

Key Informant Selection

At the December meeting, board members suggested several persons for staff to contact for interviews. The majority of key informants were identified by the special education administrators or superintendents of the selected districts, with other informants recommended by informants during their interviews.

A breakdown of the number and type of informants by school district is as follows:

Native American	Migrant
Darrington-7D	Lynden- 1D* 1N
LaConner- 5D 4N	Mt. Vernon- 5D 1N
Marysville- 5D 1N	Burlington- 3D 1N
Ferndale/Bellingham- 9D 2N	Sedro Woolley- 3D 2N

*Lynden staff submitted a written group response

Other non-district interviews- 4 (Indian Health Service, Project REACH, NW Intertribal Preschool, Northwest ESD 189 Migrant Program)

D= school district informant
N= nondistrict informant

Interview Questions

The study protocol called for project staff to obtain the key informants' responses to a common set of questions so that responses could be compared within district, and across informant roles (i.e., parent responses, administrator responses).

The Board provided the following interview questions:

1. What tests are used in your district to determine a child's dominant language?
   - Does your district use a screening tool to identify bilingual children?

- Is this test administered by a trained professional who speaks the child's native language fluently?

2. Are tests for special education placement for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students to establish language competency (proficiency and dominance) routinely given in both languages?

3. Does your district use an interpreter to screen and/or assess bilingual children?
   - If so, what training do interpreters have, and how are they used in the identification process?
   - Is the interpreter literate in the child's primary language, and what level of language is used by the interpreter?

4. When staff in your district are testing LEP students who have non-English speaking parents, how is informed consent for those children obtained?
   - Are due process forms mailed to parents?
   - Is this process similar for Native American and for migrant children?

5. What procedures/assessment tools are used to identify and test preschool LEP students for special education?

6. Are LEP students in your district ever placed in special education because of a lack of other program resources?

7. In your district, are migrant students who are determined eligible under Federal migrant regulations for special education reported to the district's special education office?

8. What kind of training does the special education staff receive to insure that Native American/migrant children are being appropriately assessed to determine their eligibility for special education?

9. How frequently do Native American/migrant children meet special education eligibility based upon professional judgment?
   - What is the rationale used in ruling out the influence of cultural, environmental, and economic factors on educational progress?

10. Do parents of Native American/migrant children in special education participate in the IEP process?
    - How frequently do they attend the annual IEP meeting?
    - What accommodations, if any, are made for non-English speaking parents, parents from Native American cultures?

11. Can you think of any other unique problems you have had in teaching Native American/migrant students?
    - How have you/others in your district dealt with these problems?
    - What sort of accommodations have been successful/not so successful?

Results

This section summarizes the results of each of the eleven questions that respondents were asked.

1. **What tests are used in your district to determine a child's dominant language?**

   - Does the district use a screening tool to identify bilingual children?
   - Is this test administered by a trained professional who speaks the child's native language fluently?

Determining the Child's Native Language

All five of the responding districts use the Language Assessment Scale (LAS) for determining a child's dominant language. Respondents indicated that the LAS is sometimes used in combination with another measure: the Distar Language Test or a language survey. Other instruments mentioned were the Home Language Survey, the Pre-LAS and the Basic Inventory of Natural Language (BINL). One respondent said that the district relied on the Child Study Team.

Screening Tools for Identifying Bilingual Children

All of the districts surveyed used a screening tool to identify bilingual children. In most cases, the LAS results were used. The Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) was used in one district for quick screening. One district indicated that it did not have a screening tool for special education.

Test Administration

In most cases, respondents said that professionals (i.e., a certified teacher, CDS) administer these tests, but that they are sometimes not fluent in the child's language. In several districts trained bilingual aides administer the tests and/or serve as interpreters for the professionals administering the test.

2. **Are tests for special education placement for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students to establish language competency (proficiency and dominance) routinely given in both languages?**

Responses to this question suggested that most often tests to establish language competency for special education placement are not given in both languages.

Personnel within the same district frequently did not agree on this item: some said the tests were given in both languages, and others said they were not. Two districts indicated that there were no bilingual children in special education so they had not yet had a need

to determine the dominant language. The tests that were mentioned included: the Woodcock Johnson in Spanish and English, the LAS in Spanish and English, and the SOMPA in English.

3. **Does your district use an interpreter to screen and/or assess bilingual children?**

   - If so, what training do interpreters have, and how are they used in the identification process?
   - Is the interpreter literate in the child's primary language, and what level of language is used by the interpreter?

Use of Interpreters in Screening and Assessment

Interpreters or special education staff who are fluent in Spanish were used in all but one of the districts for screening and assessment. In the one district that does not use interpreters, the low referral rate and the risk of compromising test results were given as reasons for not using interpreters. Special education departments usually turn to the migrant and bilingual aides and teachers to serve as interpreters for assessment and screening.

Training for Interpreters

It appeared that there is some training for interpreters. However, comments indicated that aides who serve as interpreters and/or test administrators may not be adequately trained.

Literate Interpreters

Responses regarding the literacy of interpreters were mixed, often within the same district. Personnel in two of the five responding districts unanimously agreed that the aides were literate: in the remaining three districts there was disagreement and concern about the literacy of the interpreters.

4. **When staff in your district are testing Limited English Proficient children who have non-English speaking parents, how is informed consent for those children obtained?**

   - Are due process forms mailed to parents?
   - Is this process similar for Native American and for migrant children?

Obtaining Informed Consent

Most respondents indicated that staff from migrant and bilingual programs were recruited to assist in obtaining parental consent for testing. Some home visitors expressed concern that they were not accompanied by special education staff on these

visits. In several cases, home visitors refused to seek parental consent without being accompanied by a special education representative. In other cases, the migrant staff serve only as interpreters for special education staff.

Concern was expressed that parents were signing for testing without clearly understanding the process or their rights.

In another district with a strong commitment on the part of all staff to do everything possible to keep special education students in the regular classroom, it was not clear that Native American parents are told that their child is special education eligible (i.e., not familiar with the term or concept of IEP).

Mailing Due Process Forms

Responses were mixed, even within the same district, regarding whether or not due process forms were mailed. It appears that the practice is used to varying degrees in many of the districts surveyed. Some have translated the forms into Spanish. One respondent reported that the district mailed English forms to the parent with a note in Spanish requesting that they sign the forms.

Due Process for Native American Parents

Due process forms appeared to be mailed more frequently to the Native American parents: the reason cited was that they speak English. Two districts used home visitors drawn from the Native American staff.

5. **What procedures/assessment tools are used to identify and test preschool students with Limited English Proficiency for special education?**

None of the staff interviewed from three of the five responding districts knew the tests or procedures used to assess students with limited English proficiency. Of these districts, one indicated that preschool services were provided through an outside agency, and another suggested that because the students all speak English there had not been a need to define a procedure.

Two of the districts did have a process in place for assessing preschool students with limited English proficiency. In the first district, the teacher goes to the migrant camps before school to conduct screening. Then, assessments are conducted at the school.

In the second district which had a small population of migrant students, respondents indicated that no one is actively pursuing preschoolers with limited English proficiency. A test developed in the district was cited as the screening instrument used to refer children to Chapter 1, kindergarten, or special education.

6. **Are Limited English Proficient students in your district ever placed in special education because of a lack of other program resources?**

Responses to this question were mixed within two of the five districts: some personnel thought that students with limited English proficiency were placed in special education due to a lack of other options-- others thought they were not. In the three districts that clearly stated that special education placements were not used because of a lack of other options, the availability of other special program options was cited as the reason. Other options included bilingual resource rooms, and elementary services that do not require "labelling." Another reason cited for not using special education placement was that faculty did not over-refer.

Among the respondents who felt that special education placements were made because of a lack of other options, a need for bilingual programs was expressed. One respondent indicated that the district had an ESL program but also needed a bilingual program.

Concern was expressed about the lack of appropriate placement options for bilingual students. Special education staff are faced with the dilemma of placing students in special education or not providing any special help to students who are experiencing severe academic problems.

7. **In your district, are students who are determined eligible under federal migrant regulations for special education reported to the district's special education office?**

   Who reports the child's special education status?

This question was designed to determine if the special education status of entering migrant students was reported to the special education office in order to insure timely and appropriate placements. Unfortunately, responses to the question provide little information about this issue.

However, the responses did reveal several things about the usefulness of the Migrant Student Reporting and Tracking System (MSRTS). Respondents who referred to the MSRTS expressed concern about the information contained in the system. MSRTS information is frequently slow to arrive at the school and incomplete. Individual teachers expressed frustration at having to call MSRTS
directly to obtain missing data. School records arrive well after the child has arrived. In one case a severely handicapped child arrived without any prior notice.

8. **What kind of training does the special education staff receive to insure that Native American and migrant children are being appropriately assessed to determine their eligibility for special education?**

There was overwhelming agreement in the nine responding districts that there was no formal in-district training procedure to insure that Native American and migrant children are being appropriately assessed. Most respondents suggested that training is needed: only one respondent indicated that no request for training had been received.

Even though there is a lack of formal, in-district training, a number of districts had informal procedures to help insure appropriate assessment results. Several districts cited meetings of the Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) as a forum for assuring appropriate assessments. Others described informal sharing among staff, particularly in smaller districts, as an effective means of staff development.

Workshops outside the district (provided by Northwest ESD 189 and the state) were mentioned a number of times by respondents as valuable inservice opportunities that were utilized. Most of the outside inservice referred to however, was general multicultural training and did not specifically target the assessment issue.

Many respondents indicated that personnel should have received this type of training in personnel preparation programs. One district has designed a hiring process that includes evaluating candidates' sensitivity to cultural issues, and in another district staff felt that teachers' cultural sensitivity was a factor considered for placement at the reservation-based school. Another district contracts with a local tribe for school staff.

This question elicited a concern regarding school district personnel understanding of students' native cultures, particularly for school staff dealing with Native American students and families. Respondents felt that an understanding of Native American culture and rituals would help schools respond more appropriately to students' educational needs, provide services in a way that is more consistent with their culture, and help explain some of the unique characteristics of Native American students.

9. **How frequently do Native American or migrant children meet special education eligibility based on professional judgment?**

   What is the rationale used in ruling out the influence of cultural, environmental, and economic factors on educational progress?

Use of Professional Judgment

Most of the personnel interviewed in each of the nine districts surveyed replied that Native American and migrant children rarely meet special education eligibility criteria based upon professional judgment. However, in five of the districts at least one respondent indicated that professional judgment is always used.

This discrepancy may be due in part to the respondents' interpretation of the question: professional judgment can be used to include students inappropriately who do not meet the testing criteria but do need special services, or it can be used to exclude students who do meet testing criteria but may not be truly handicapped in the eyes of the evaluator. In the words of one administrator, "If we only looked at test scores, many students would be automatically referred."

The availability of other program options and services appears to influence the number of students who are evaluated for special education. In response to this question, four of the districts indicated that they seek out and try other program options, such as LAP or Chapter I, before referring students to special education. Several respondents said that they try to avoid special education placement and focus on serving students in the regular classroom. One district uses the language delayed or "CDS" only categories to protect against labeling students inappropriately.

The cultural bias of available standardized tests was cited a number of times. One district hired a Native American to provide assessment services to address this problem. There was wide recognition of the inadequacy of tests for use with minority children. However, three respondents (not psychologists) felt that just looking at test scores was adequate for making eligibility determinations. A CDS in one district reported ongoing efforts to identify culture-free assessments for use with Native American students, and identified the following measures in use for 3-6-year-olds:

3 yr.olds -	Sequenced Inventory of Communication Development (SICD), Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT), Expressive One-Word Vocabulary Test (EOWVT) compared to language sample
4 yr.olds -	PPVT, EOWVT, Test of Early Language Development (TELD) compared to language sample
1st-2nd graders -	Boehm Basic Concepts, Auditory Pointing, Test of Language Development-Primary (TOLD-P).

To protect against the over-identification of minority students for special education services, several districts used the MDT process.

The responses of two Native American tribal representatives from different districts reflect the dilemma faced by districts and parents when considering special education placement. The two respondents expressed opposite viewpoints in regard to classifying students for special education. One felt that it was very difficult for Native American students to qualify for special education and receive needed services. The other felt that students were too frequently included in special education and inappropriately labeled handicapped. While the need for "special" services is great, the non-special education resources available are sparse.

Rationale for Ruling out Cultural, Environmental and Economic Factors

Most respondents indicated that the assessment process included obtaining a picture of the "whole child" and looking beyond just the test scores. This included a review of school history and performance, adaptive behavior, the child's behavior in relationship to peers and siblings, and the parents' view of the child.

Many districts relied on the MDT to rule out the influence of cultural, environmental, and economic factors. Three districts used the state regulations for guidance in this area. None of the respondents referred to a formal district process for ruling out the influence of cultural, environmental and economic factors, but several respondents suggested that this would be helpful.

10. **Do parents of Native American and migrant children in special education participate in the IEP process?**

    How frequently do they attend the annual IEP meeting?
    What accommodations, if any, are made for non-English speaking parents or parents from Native American cultures?

Parent IEP Participation and Attendance

Parent participation in the IEP and attendance at the IEP conference was a problem in all of the districts. While most districts indicated that parents did attend meetings, it was difficult to "get them there." It appears that districts expend a great deal of effort to get parents to attend the initial IEP meeting, and are usually successful in arranging this meeting. However, subsequent meetings are not well attended and less effort is expended. Parents of primary aged children were more likely to attend IEPs than parents of older children.

Respondents indicated that parents whose children enroll in 0-3 programs and who are exposed to the IEP process when their children are young tend to feel most comfortable with and least intimidated by the process.

There were a number of exceptions, however, and several respondents indicated that parents of Native American children participate as much as or more than parents of Anglo children. Problems with getting parents of migrant children to attend meetings were mentioned in most of the districts serving these students. Several respondents indicated that parent participation really varies and it is difficult to characterize parents of minority children as less involved.

Even in those districts that cited a high rate of parent participation (90% in one, 80-100% in the other), the same respondents indicated that parent participation was a problem, and that Native American parents tend to be passive participants, and would be

unlikely to challenge a decision. It was suggested that simply attending an IEP meeting did not constitute parent involvement, and that parents are not encouraged to contribute to the child's IEP but to merely sign-off.

Parents of Native American children who were interviewed expressed great concern. They felt that the schools did not encourage or respond to their requests. One parent of a high school student had never been invited to an IEP meeting and received the IEP in the mail each year with a request for her signature.

Among both migrant and Native American families parental attitudes toward school were used to explain low levels of parental involvement. It was suggested that parents distrusted teachers and schools based on their experiences as students and parents. Parents were also described as being complacent and willing to go along with the schools' recommendations. Several district respondents indicated that parents were not aware how special education might affect their child's school future, or did not know their rights to seek other services and opinions.

Other barriers to parent participation were also cited. The fishing season and important cultural celebrations prevent many Native American parents from attending. The nature of migrant labor prevents families from attending meetings during the long work day.

With regard to migrant and non-English speaking parents, concern was expressed that they receive different treatment than the parents of white children. Frequently, the migrant teacher or home visitor takes the IEP to the home rather than having the parents meet with the special education teacher and other personnel who developed the IEP.

Those districts with reservation-based preschool programs suggested that the preschool had helped to increase parent involvement. Parent activities (field trips, workshops) were regularly scheduled to increase familiarity and trust among preschool staff and parents.

Accommodations to Encourage Parent Involvement

Most of the districts made accommodations to encourage involvement. These included home visits, interpreters, transportation, leaving parts of the IEP for parents to complete with staff during the meeting, flexible scheduling, willingness to reschedule, limiting the size of meetings, simplifying forms, involving Indian or migrant staff, sending reminder letters, scheduled phone calls, ride pooling, and holding meetings at the tribal center or at the home. However, many respondents were frustrated because their attempts at accommodation were not successful in increasing parent involvement.

The more successful districts seemed to take very seriously the need to make parents feel comfortable in the meetings. Frequently, home visits were cited as less successful because they increased the parents' discomfort.

One of the more successful interventions was to use Native American liaisons (usually funded through Johnson O'Malley funds) to help explain the process to parents, and to provide transportation. However, there were problems with this approach when it was not a collaborative effort and the liaison was used as a messenger. The same problems were evident in cases where the migrant home visitor was used as a messenger rather than as a member of a team.

One district felt that school staff were not welcome on the reservation. School districts that have provided transportation for parents have had mixed results. Sometimes it works, sometimes it doesn't.

11. **Can you think of any other unique problems you have had in teaching Native American or migrant students?**

    How have you and others in your district dealt with these problems?
    What sort of accommodations have been successful or not so successful?

This was an open ended question that allowed respondents to identify additional concerns and discuss innovative approaches. Responses most frequently highlighted additional concerns and reinforced concerns expressed in other answers. The following summary highlights the concerns and practices that were mentioned most frequently.

Drop-outs

Both Native American and migrant students were perceived as being at very high risk of dropping out of school. In reference to the magnitude of the drop-out problem respondents used words like "astronomical" and "very high." Many respondents indicated that this was their biggest problem or concern in serving both Native American and migrant students.

Estimates of the size of the problem were always just that: a rough guess. Figures quoted included 85%, 50-60%, and 25%. Several districts expressed concern that they could not get firm figures on the size of the drop-out problem. For Native American students, movement between reservations, between school districts near different reservations, and the tendency for individual students to drop out more than once were cited as some of the barriers to pinning down the drop-out rate. District staff could not provide information on what proportion of dropouts migrate, return to school, enroll in a tribal school, or are affected by drug/alcohol problems.

Dropping out of school generally occurs at the middle school level or between high school and middle school, according to the people interviewed. Native Americans with tribal affiliations were perceived by some to be at greater risk of dropping out than students living off the reservation.

Some of the solutions that were suggested or already in place included: providing more flexible and appropriate alternative secondary programs, particularly vocational programs; hiring drop-out prevention staff jointly funded by school districts and tribes; initiating drop-out prevention activities before middle school; obtaining greater parent involvement in addressing the problem; offering bilingual support to students who need it. In one district, the tribe's concern about their students' high drop out rates was the stimulus for the tribe's leaders to approach the district and undertake cooperative action and preventive strategies

Attendance and Absences

Poor attendance was mentioned very frequently as an obstacle to providing services to students. This problem was mentioned most frequently in regard to Native American students. The seasonal fishing cycle and important cultural ceremonies were mentioned by both white and Native American respondents as obstacles to attendance.

The attendance problem seemed to be greater with older children. One district identified attendance as the biggest problem for its migrant students. One respondent mentioned that attendance in kindergarten and grade one are a problem with Native American students, whose parents often don't recognize the importance of primary education for young children.

Communication and joint planning between the tribe and the school district improved attendance in some cases. One district got the PTA involved to provide attendance incentives. Several respondents felt that making a personal appeal to and developing a relationship over time with the tribe had helped to improve attendance. In one district, half-day kindergarten attendance was seriously affected because noon transportation was not provided between the reservation and the school.

Parent Participation

Participation by parents was cited as a major problem. School districts felt that they had done everything they could to encourage parent participation. Parents (particularly Native American parents) felt that they did not have a voice in educational planning for their children.

There was a general feeling among Native American respondents that parents were not adequately informed of their rights. District staff cited instances when they were unaware of important cultural differences that should have been considered in involving parents (i.e., having too many people at IEP meetings, asking questions perceived as very personal by the Native American parents.) For many Native American parents their first contact with the school is a meeting that focuses on their child's delays or problems. District staff indicated an appreciation of the long history of distrust between "anglo

teachers" and Native American people. Remedies suggested were to increase staff stability and concentrate on building trusting relationships.

Respondents expressed concern that parents of migrant children agree too easily with school staff, think the school "knows best," and have unreal expectations of what the schools can do. There was also concern that migrant parents were not made to feel comfortable in the school environment. Registration forms are all in English. School staff are not bilingual. Letters, newsletters, notices to parents are always in English unless they come from the bilingual program.

Cultural Awareness

A lack of cultural awareness among school district personnel was cited as a problem by both consumers and staff. Schools felt that they had great difficulty obtaining information about both Native American and Hispanic cultures. Several suggested they did not know where to turn for resources.

In regard to minority children, staff, consumers, and advocates felt that students were looked down upon and that discrimination is a problem. For Native American students there was concern that they are written off by teachers. Differences in language and social skills have led school personnel to misclassify the behavior of Native American children and misinterpret their behavior.

Suggestions for increasing cultural sensitivity included: training school staff on customs and culture; making accommodations for cultural differences (e.g., providing small group instruction for Native American students, interpreting the meaning of silence in other cultures, creating a classroom atmosphere of respect for different cultures); field trips. In one district where REACH (multicultural awareness) training was suggested by some respondents, the school district was described as being unreceptive.

Funding

Inadequate resources and funding for bilingual services were noted by most respondents involved with migrant programs. Limited funding restricted districts' ability to provide bilingual programs, and forced districts to rely on existing staff, rather than hiring trained bilingual staff. Bilingual programs are frequently underfunded and isolated, often requiring professional staff to perform secretarial duties and purchase supplies.

The $500 that districts can claim for serving migrant students is seen by some as an incentive for qualification but not services. This coupled with an unwillingness to use basic education funds to support bilingual services raised questions about the adequacy of programs for migrant students.

Communication Between Tribes and Schools

Poor communication between tribes and schools was mentioned frequently as a barrier to providing educational services. Tribal representatives felt that districts make decisions without consulting tribal leadership. Poor communication leads to misunderstandings. Tribes perceive that their needs have been set aside. A long history of racial conflict was identified by several respondents.

Many school district personnel recognized that they had been unsuccessful in communicating with tribal leadership. Some district personnel felt rebuffed by the tribes, indicating that the political climate was bad, or that "we don't speak the same language." Turnover in tribal leadership was identified as a barrier to ongoing district-tribal communication.

One district attributes much of its success in serving its large population of Native American students to monthly meetings of the school board and the tribal senate, which have served as a forum for parents, school staff, and tribal leaders to discuss their concerns.

One of the most frequently mentioned approaches for addressing this problem was using a Native American liaison. Many times these positions were funded by Johnson O'Malley (JOM) funds. Liaisons assumed many different roles: working with students and parents, trouble shooting on behalf of students by observing in classes, arranging meetings between parents and teachers to discuss educational placements and problems, and providing transportation for parents. The role of the liaison is a still being developed in many districts, and the liaison often continues to be viewed as a "policeman" rather than as a member of the educational team.

Preschool and birth-to-three programs for Native American children were mentioned by many respondents as a ground breaking precedent to increasing interaction between the tribes and the schools. Some of the most successful programs are located on the reservation and include tribe members and leaders in planning and operation.

Appropriate Services for Migrant Students

In general, respondents were concerned that appropriate programs and services for migrant and bilingual students were not available. Placement in special education does not often lead to appropriate services. Few special education staff speak Spanish or have training in bilingual services. A need for special education services with a bilingual/bicultural component was expressed. Respondents identified the problem of distinguishing children who are actually handicapped from children who are not proficient in English, and described their desire to provide services without labelling children.

Over-referral to special education was seen by some to result from a lack of appropriate services, particularly bilingual programs for migrant students. Not all the districts have trained staff to assess and serve bilingual students. Regular education teachers were viewed as being unwilling to implement suggestions from bilingual staff. A lack of awareness of the importance and nature of bilingual programs was cited as a barrier to appropriate programming.

Respondents recommended a team effort for identifying and assessing children with limited English proficiency for special education. The team would represent special education, bilingual, and ESL staff. Placing children who are a focus of concern in a bilingual classroom would allow staff to better determine whether the student's educational deficits result from a handicapping condition or language and cultural differences. In another district which uses MDTs to identify the most appropriate placements for Native American students at risk for special education, the MDT process was recommended for all students.

Appropriate Services for Native American Students

Many respondents expressed concern over the lack of appropriate program options for Native American students, particularly in the secondary area. School district respondents felt that they had difficulty matching the needs of Native American students to the existing curriculum. Consumers and parents agreed on their desire for more flexible hours of attendance, and alternative program offerings.

The relevance of special education classes was called into question. In the elementary grades, respondents felt that removing students from the regular classroom denied them access to important learning experiences. In the secondary grades, respondents saw a need for life skills classes and class options that would prepare students for employment and independent living.

Several respondents also indicated that they would like to see more Native Americans employed by the school districts as tutors and educators. A number of school districts did in fact employ Native Americans, particularly in preschool programs. This approach has been successful in increasing parent involvement and improving relationships between tribes and school districts. One concern was finding trained Native American para-professionals for tutor and aide positions. Northwest Indian College has a program to prepare Native Americans for employment in a variety of education and counseling positions.

Some schools were characterized by consumers as not being proactive. Innovative programs and new approaches are needed to address the serious problems experienced by Native American students. Some suggestions for new programs included: alternative high school programs with flexible hours and relevant classes, tutoring, counseling for short-term crisis intervention, and an extended school year.

In some districts, mainstream programming has increased and respondents were very supportive.

Preschool and Birth to Three Programs

Preschool programs serving handicapped and non-handicapped children were seen as a bright spot in the service continuum by an overwhelming number of respondents. Several of the participating school districts have recently started preschool programs, frequently located on reservations.

Some respondents felt that these programs are very beneficial in preparing young children for a successful school experience. The programs get parents involved earlier and to a greater degree. Trusting relationships are being built over time. One program even included case management and coordination with Department of Social and Health services personnel. The programs frequently are housed in a prominent place on the reservation. In one district however, staff felt that housing the program on the reservation was too isolating.

The preschool to kindergarten transition was described as potentially difficult. One district reported success with a half-day developmental kindergarten for Native American preschoolers not yet ready for full-day kindergarten.

Several district respondents mentioned the unmet health needs of preschool/elementary Native American pupils.

Substance Abuse, Fetal Alcohol Syndrome (FAS), Fetal Alcohol Effects (FAE), and Teenage Pregnancy

Many respondents raised concerns about the ability of school districts and the adequacy of resources to provide programs for the anticipated influx of children affected by pre-natal drug/alcohol abuse, and AIDS. No solutions were offered, but grave concern was expressed.

A need for parenting resources (e.g., parent skills training, sex/drug education, homework assistance training), support and education was raised by several respondents.

Mainstreaming

Serving Native American students in the regular classroom was regarded by consumers and school district personnel alike as important. Parents felt strongly that special education placement was too isolating. Students do not like to be singled-out. Staff and parent respondents agreed that students miss too much when they are pulled out of classes.

Recommendations

The following recommendations follow primarily from interview results. Some of the recommendations also reflect our review of the literature on educational best practices for migrant, bilingual, and Native American students. Not all recommendations will apply to all districts involved in this study.

The interview data collected for this study and findings comprise an extensive needs assessment, and together with the recommendations, should serve as the basis for future grant proposals.

Recommendations for Districts Serving Migrant Students

1. Training for persons administering the LAS should be provided.

   - Staff administering the LAS to migrant children should receive competency-based training in the assessment of language dominance and in the administration of the LAS. The developers of the LAS are available to provide on-site training that meets standards for testing.

2. Districts use a standard battery of tests of language dominance and proficiency. Assessment personnel need to have appropriate training in the use of standardized tests, in what tests can and cannot do. Personnel also need training in writing eligibility reports that address the pupil's adaptive behavior, evidence of opportunity to learn, and appropriate curriculum-based measures. (Please see footnotes 1 and 3.)

3. The use of interpreters in the assessment and screening process needs to be reviewed in each district. Standards describing how interpreters should assist in the assessment process and accompanying training for assessment staff and interpreters need to be developed.

   - The use of interpreters in test administration will render test scores and results invalid. Interpreting tests that are normed and standardized for use in English affects both the reliability and validity of results. It can be argued that the use of interpreters is just one of many things that affect the usefulness of test results. Indeed, given the complex nature of language acquisition, the tests themselves probably do not provide meaningful information for identifying handicapping conditions or for designing appropriate educational programs.

     For these reasons, determining eligibility for special education requires the use of professional judgment. Heavy reliance on test scores will result in inappropriate referrals. Interpreters can be very useful in collecting information that will enhance the ability of assessment staff to make appropriate referrals to special

education. We recommend that districts pilot the use of new guidelines for professional judgment in assessments.

Interpreters can be used very effectively in the assessment process for interviews and informal assessments that allow the assessment team to observe a child interacting with a speaker of his native language. In addition, interpreters can serve as a critical link between parents and the assessment team. Parents are likely to be the most important source of information when assessing bilingual children. The cross-cultural project at OSPI is developing materials that will assist districts in determining the best roles for interpreters.

Assessment teams, including building principals, special education teachers, psychologists, and interpreters, need to be trained on how to most effectively use interpreter services in the assessment process. In addition, interpreters need training in each of the specific tasks that they will conduct.

4. Bilingual staff need access to clerical support.

   - To maximize limited bilingual staff time and resources, clerical support needs to be provided to reduce the amount of time these professional staff now spend on clerical/administrative tasks.

5. Districts in Northwest ESD 189 need to work with OSPI to develop guidelines for training assessment personnel in districts that serve large numbers of migrant students.

   - The assessment of migrant and bilingual children requires special knowledge. Districts need guidance and support to assure that assessment staff are adequately trained in the assessment of bilingual students for special education. State policy may be needed to require training and provide support for assessment personnel in districts that serve large numbers of migrant and bilingual students. (Please see footnote 1.)

6. Districts in Northwest ESD 189 need to work with OSPI to develop guidelines regarding the assessment of preschool students with limited English proficiency and in Childfind procedures for this group.

   - The assessment of preschool children with limited English proficiency presents special challenges. School district staff need training and support in selecting and using appropriate instruments for this group. One solution would be to establish a bilingual/preschool ESD assessment team to provide services on a regional level and conduct Childfind activities during the summer.

7. Bilingual services and structured immersion programs need to be available to migrant children in both regular and special education.

- Research has shown that bilingual instruction is appropriate and most frequently necessary for children who are educationally at risk. The nature of language development in the early years demands that schools focus on developing the child's native language.

  In order to distinguish learning disabled children from children who have limited English proficiency or who are in transition from Spanish to English, bilingual services need to be provided outside of special education as well. "Submersion" programs where only English is spoken are not effective. A properly conducted immersion program utilizes instruction in English with explanations in Spanish. Appropriate bilingual programs require teachers who are bilingual. There are now no bilingual programs in the region; we recommend that bilingual programs be increased across the state. (Please see footnotes 2 and 3 and final recommendation.)

8. State guidelines need to be established to clarify the distinctions between ESL, migrant, bilingual and other programs serving non-English speaking children to assure that non-migrant bilingual children are receiving services.

   - Nonmigrant bilingual children are "falling through the cracks" despite their need for bilingual programs. Small districts or districts with small numbers of bilingual students need support in serving bilingual students. Regional and itinerant support services may need to be developed.

9. District level policies and procedures regarding the use and updating of MSRTS data need to be developed.

   - MSRTS data need to be accessed immediately upon the arrival of a new migrant student. District procedures need to clarify who is responsible for forwarding data to the classroom teacher, what the timeline is for receipt of the data (e.g., within 5 days), what actions should be taken by the teacher if the information is not received inside the specified time frame, and the process for calling the sending school district if MSRTS data is incomplete.

     Each district had a person who was designated to update MSRTS data on a regular basis. Care should be taken to assure that this information is updated at least monthly. Other staff in the district need to know who had been designated to update and retrieve MSRTS data. In addition, staff need to receive training on how to access and use MSRTS data.

Recommendations for Districts Serving Native American Students

1. Preschool programs, including birth to 3, for Native American handicapped and nonhandicapped children should be used as an opportunity to stimulate and build parent involvement.

   - Preschool programs and birth to 3 programs offer districts an excellent opportunity to foster parent involvement and set the stage for future relationships with families. Special attention should be given to fostering positive relationships during the transition from preschool to kindergarten.

2. Native American liaisons should be viewed as members of the educational team and used to foster positive relationships between tribal members and the schools.

   - Frequently supported by JOM funds, the liaisons can assist districts in communicating with parents, examining program options, providing transportation, and working with tribal leadership.

3. Thoughtful and consistent efforts are needed to improve the communication and working relationship between tribal leadership and the schools.

   - Before individuals within the districts and the tribes can work together, the two systems need to be working together. LaConner School District provides one example of how tribal leadership and the school districts can collaborate to improve educational programs for Native American students. Four years ago, the LaConner school board began to meet monthly with the tribal senate, and these meetings have become an educational forum where parents, district staff, and tribal members can and do voice their concerns and influence district and tribal policies.

4. Schools need to explore the use of Native American tutoring programs for handicapped and non-handicapped students as a means of promoting cultural self-awareness, interaction among Native American students, and drug/alcohol awareness programs, as well as a means to provide educational support.

   - The integration of Native American students into the schools has frequently reduced their contact with their culture and with other Native American students. Many respondents indicated a need to address substance abuse problems among Native American youth.

Recommendations for Districts Serving Migrant/Bilingual and Native American Students

1. School districts need to carefully examine their policies for obtaining informed consent for assessment and IEPs.

   - With regard to migrant students, districts need to make sure that interpreters are trained in the assessment and IEP process, parent rights, informed consent, and due process procedures. To be effective, interpreters need to be more than just literal interpreters.

     When obtaining parental consent for subsequent IEPs, the district's minimum effort should be to mail forms and make a phone call to the family to explain the forms. Districts are required to provide forms in Spanish; however, mailing these forms does not respect the congressional intent to assure that parents fully understand their rights in the assessment and educational process, which requires bilingual presentation of written materials. This is an Office of Civil Rights (OCR) requirement, with enforcement under Section 504.

2. Districts should make accommodations to help parents attend meetings at school.

   - Some successful accommodations include: providing transportation, enlisting the help of other agencies or tribal representatives, scheduling meetings at night for migrant families, involving the Migrant Advisory Council.

3. Districts need to provide assessment staff with training in aspects of Native American and Hispanic cultures that may affect assessment results and interpretation.

   - District personnel explicitly requested training in Native American culture. The fact we did not hear any requests for similar training in Hispanic culture suggests a need for increased awareness of Hispanic cultural issues. Child rearing practices, ceremonies, religion, interpersonal interactions, family roles and dynamics are among the areas on which school staff need information.

4. Districts should conduct an annual internal review of the incidence of migrant and Native American students in special education as a part of their evaluation of assessment and placement practices.

   - The disproportionate representation of minorities in special education should trigger an internal district review. Reasons for disproportionate representation need to be identified. Data collected for this study show that Native American students are frequently over represented in special education, and that migrant and bilingual students are under represented.

5. The practice of using migrant home visitors and Native American liaisons as "messengers" for informed consent and IEP sign-offs needs to be examined.

   - The difficulty districts have in contacting minority parents has led some districts to use "messengers" to obtain consent from parents. The legal ramifications of this practice as well as the broader issue of parent involvement need to be examined.

     Interpreters who are used by districts to obtain informed consent from minority parents need training in special education regulations.

6. Districts need to conduct careful internal reviews of parent involvement and due process practices to assure compliance with the law.

   - Many comments regarding unequal treatment of minority parents were received from parents as well as staff. If minority parents feel that they are being treated unfairly, it has implications for the districts' ability to educate students and obtain meaningful parent involvement.

7. Systems for collecting incidence data and monitoring the status of drop-outs need to be put into place.

   - Districts need to track and follow minority drop-outs in order to identify reasons for dropping out (e.g., irrelevant curricula, inappropriate instructional practices, drug/alcohol problem, poor performance), current status of drop-outs, and the number of drop-outs who migrate or re-enroll.

8. Drop-out prevention efforts need to be implemented beginning at the elementary level.

   - Districts reported that the drop-out problem becomes serious by middle school. Efforts to prevent students from dropping out in middle and high school need to begin at the elementary level and continue through the secondary grades.

9. In consultation with tribal leadership and migrant/bilingual representatives, district staff need to carefully scrutinize program options at the secondary level to determine if they meet students' academic, vocational, and life skills needs. Particular attention should be paid to the relevance of program offerings for students from non-anglo cultures.

   - Some believe the term "pushed-out" to be more accurate than "dropped-out" when referring to the large numbers of Native American and migrant/bilingual students who do not complete high school. Providing appropriate services to this group may require a complete revamp of the secondary curriculum rather than simply adding a class or two. Programs that are relevant to the needs of minority students

at risk of dropping out should be made available in all districts, and should be linked to post-school options in the community.

10. Cultural awareness training should be provided to all new teachers.

- Teachers serving minority populations must be sensitive to cultural issues. Some districts screen applicants for cultural awareness in the hiring process. Districts should consider identifying a community contact to assist in cultural awareness training. In some districts, a tribal representative or education specialist, for example, may be contracted to introduce district staff to the local Native American culture. REACH staff and ESD staff may be available to provide support

11. Districts should use flexibility in scheduling classes and in constructing programs to assure that the needs of minority students are met.

- A student's involvement in a tribe's fishing season or a harvesting season may seriously conflict with rigid class schedules. Flexible programs must be available for the needs of local minority groups. Some successful options include half-day, late starting, and evening classes, and summer school.

12. Schools should create a learning environment that respects and supports the cultures of minority students.

- Schools which encourage structuring the learning environment to reflect and incorporate the culture of students demonstrate a respect for minority students and their families, and enrich the lives of all students by broadening their understanding of other groups in the community. These cultural programs must include more than food and dance.

13. There should be an ESD-wide effort to recruit Spanish speaking and Native American teachers.

- Creating an indigenous cadre of trained professionals from the Hispanic and Native American communities should be a long-term statewide goal. This would address the major problems the interviews revealed in the areas of appropriate bilingual assessment, bilingual instruction, and teachers' understanding/identification with students' native cultures.

  Consideration should be given to developing a career ladder for local Hispanic and Native American paraprofessionals to provide them with on-site training that leads to a teaching credential (Please see Footnote 4). This training could be offered through a local community college. By recruiting locally in this way for bilingual staff, districts may avoid the significant problems of recruiting graduates of

university programs to rural areas, and struggling with the poor retention rates for these non-native professionals.

Footnotes

1. **Recommendations for Cognitive Assessment of LEP Students**

Best practices in educational assessment for special education placement of migrant/bilingual and Native American children must reflect current federal and state regulations regarding the assessment process. Although such guidelines are intended to insure an appropriate and equitable evaluation, this is often not the case for the culturally different and bilingual child. Regulations that require administration of specific standardized tests place the assessment team in a difficult position when they begin to work with a culturally different student who has been referred to special education.

Federal safeguards regarding nondiscriminatory assessment are defined in PL 94-142, Section 612 (5), which requires states to establish appropriate procedures that will not be racially or culturally discriminatory. These procedures require that an assessment be conducted in the child's native language or mode of communication, and that no single procedure be the basis for identifying a handicapping condition. Nevertheless, misclassification and misplacement of culturally different and linguistic minority children continues to occur (see Bergin, 1980, Landurand, 1981, Nuttall and Landurand, 1984 for research on classification and placement of limited English proficient students). A number of judicial cases have supported Section 612 by establishing that a student's cultural and linguistic differences may not be used as the basis of identifying that child as handicapped (see Lora v. Board of Education of the City of New York, 465 F. Supp. 1211 [1977], Guadalupe v. Tempe Elementary School District case [1971]).

How might an assessment team conduct a nonbiased assessment for these students while meeting the federal and state requirements for testing? We believe that it is important to respond to the current constraints that limit the content and the process of special education assessment. Thus, we offer suggestions to assessment teams when they find that they are required to administer certain standardized tests which may be inappropriate for either bilingual or Native American children when interpreted in the prescribed manner. However, we also hope that such assessment requirements will be modified in the near future, and therefore we offer recommendations for best practices in assessment for bilingual and Native American children without considering current state and federal constraints.

Guidelines for the interpretation of standardized tests with Native American and bilingual children

1. Standardized test information should be considered as a source of information rather than a basis for predicting achievement. Such test data can provide information such as areas of strength and weakness, but the reporting of standardized scores should be avoided as much as possible. However, bureaucratic regulations involving eligibility criteria for placement of children in special education programs often include the requirement that specific IQ scores be reported in a written assessment summary. For practitioners required to report scores, it is extremely important that such scores be described in the narrative as biased, invalid indicators of the intellectual functioning of children from culturally different backgrounds. A description of the child's behavior during the test, and any particular strengths or weaknesses in test performance will provide more useful information for educational programming than IQ scores alone.

2. Multiple sources of information should be incorporated into the assessment process regardless of the suspected handicapping condition including: observational data, language dominance information, family and teacher interview data, and adaptive behavior data.

   Because intelligence tests are a significant component of most special education assessments, we encourage district assessment teams to review current research. We believe that the growing research on tests for Native American and Hispanic students will help team members as they try to make equitable intervention decisions.

Recommended Best Practices in the Assessment of Bilingual and Native American children

An excellent resource on testing/assessment of culturally different children can be found in the CEC publication entitled Education of Culturally and Linguistically Different Exceptional Children, edited by Philip C. Chinn. The chapter on assessment by Nuttall, Landurand, and Goldman, "A Critical Look at Testing and Evaluation from a Cross-cultural Perspective" describes the culturally and linguistically different population and provides a variety of possible approaches to reduce bias in testing. The approach they recommend is referred to as the global approach and it is described as follows:

" In this approach, nonbiased assessment is viewed as a process rather than a set of instruments. Multifactored assessment values language dominance, adaptive behavior, and sociocultural background (Reschly, 1978). Every step in the

assessment process is evaluated as a possible source of bias (Tucker, 1980). The advantage of this approach is that it is the most comprehensive and realistic approach so far developed to aid the practitioner in identifying the sources of bias operating in the assessment system. The disadvantages in this approach are that it underestimates the role of content bias of tests, it is too time consuming and it does not guarantee eliminating bias. An example of this approach is included in Tucker's (1980) Nineteen Steps for Assuring Non-biased Placement of Students in Special Education" (p. 55).

When a referred student is limited English proficient, then the assessment team should include at least one person who speaks the child's language and is familiar with the child's culture and with bilingual education.

Areas of assessment should include the following:

1. A determination of language proficiency in both the child's native language and in English. Further, both oral and written proficiency should be determined.

2. The student should be observed in a variety of settings (regardless of the suspected handicapping condition).

3. A comprehensive home survey should be completed by an assessment team member who is familiar with the child's culture and language. This survey should address the educational background of the child, the primary language of the family as well as the neighborhood, and the level of experience the child has had with the English-speaking culture.

4. A medical exam can reveal important information about linguistically and culturally different children.

5. An academic assessment should be conducted in the child's primary language as well as in English. Informal inventories and curriculum based measurement should be included in the academic assessment (p. 57).

Another excellent resource that provides recommendations for nonbiased assessment for bilingual students is a CEC publication by Maximino Plata entitled, Assessment, Placement, and Programming of Bilingual Exceptional Pupils: A Practical Approach. Steps for assessment are similar to those listed above.

According to Cummins (1984), the classroom teacher should assume much of the responsibility in the assessment process because there are so few standardized instruments with any demonstrated validity for bilingual students. Nevertheless, the WISC-R is a frequently administered IQ test, even with minority children. Cummins (1984) offers the following suggestions for interpreting WISC-R subtests:

a) We know that it takes at least five years for immigrant students who arrive after the age of 6 years to acquire age-appropriate proficiency in both cognitive and academic areas. Thus, if a child has been administered the verbal subtests of the WISC-R and has not been exposed to English for at least 5 years, then the score should be considered an underestimate of the child's potential.

b) If a bilingual child is progressing so that the academic gap between him and his native English speaking peers is continuously closing, then that child is probably not handicapped. However, if a child's performance over time does not illustrate a "catching up" rate of progress, or if the level of achievement stays somewhat flat, then it is important to consider some type of alternative instruction and perhaps more comprehensive assessment.

c) Although it is generally assumed that LEP children perform better on the nonverbal performance scale of the WISC-R, there is some evidence that both the performance and the verbal scales may seriously underestimate the potential of LEP children.

It has been suggested that all LEP students be tested in both their native language and English, with the highest score considered as representative of the student's level of language development. However, it is important to remember that if a child obtains low scores on both tests, those scores may be a function of inappropriate tests in both languages rather than a function of the child's actual level of language development.

2. **Appropriate Services for Bilingual Migrant Students**

a) According to Cummins (1984), "immersion programs, properly understood and implemented, appear to represent an appropriate form of enrichment bilingual education for all students, majority and minority, learning disabled and non-disabled. Such programs result in additive bilingualism at no apparent cost to children's personal or academic development" (p. 176-177). Cummins states that there are no data to support the position that bilingual instruction is inappropriate (i.e., too confusing) for students who are at risk or may be experiencing learning difficulties.

An alternative viewpoint regarding structured immersion is presented by Gersten, Woodward, and Moore (1988). The authors present data to support that direct instruction, when utilized within a carefully planned structured immersion program in which all academic instruction is presented in English, can be extremely successful. The authors emphasize that it is

important to merge the English instruction with academic skills by using the child's native language to reinforce and clarify concepts, and by including discussion of the child's home culture. Finally, the authors noted that involving parents increased their support of the bilingual program.

3. **Issues in Language Proficiency**

With many migrant students, language proficiency is a critical area of assessment and educational programming. There is much research that addresses best practices in language assessment for bilingual students and both the Chinn and the Plata publications (CEC) noted above are excellent resources.

In reviewing the data from our project, it appears that an unusually high proportion of Native American children are placed in special education, while migrant/bilingual students seem to be underrepresented in special education. The reasons for this situation are unclear but one hypothesis is that in the current practice of primary language screening, the LAS may be used as the primary tool for determining whether a migrant child is in need of special education. If a child is not determined to be English proficient, many assessment teams may be reluctant to continue with a special education referral, and may instead refer the child for bilingual/migrant assistance in the school setting rather than for a multidisciplinary team assessment.

It is certainly not clear from the study data that more LEP students should be referred to special education; rather we suggest that districts consider the significance that is given to a very brief screening tool (LAS) that provides only minimal proficiency information about a child. If that tool serves as a special education screening instrument (albeit inadvertently), then alternative procedures need to be explored. For example, if a child is not proficient in English, and is struggling in the classroom, then a more comprehensive informal assessment might be considered rather than focusing primarily upon language proficiency. Many of the assessment procedures outlined above would be appropriate in a non-special education diagnostic evaluation.

4. **Personnel Preparation Models**

The following personnel preparation projects funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, have developed models for providing a range of training for paraprofessionals and Native American individuals including inservice training for paraprofessionals in identification of preschool children with communication problems, and mater's level training for Native American staff:

Papago Special Education Personnel

Preparation Program
Indian Oasis School District
Sells, Arizona

The Navajo Special Education Clinical
Teacher Development Program
Navajo Tribe
Division of Education
Window Rock, Arizona

Program for Paraprofessional Training in Special
Education and Related Services
Dull Knife Memorial College
Lame Deer, Montana

Inservice Training for Native American Paraprofessionals
in Communication Disorders
Southwest Communications Resources, Inc.
Albuquerque, New Mexico

APPENDIX A

Several recommendations from this study merit special consideration by Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction staff. These recommendations relate to two major issues: inservice training in the assessment of bilingual and LEP students, and preservice training of bilingual/bicultural and Native American staff.

Inservice Training in Test Administration

School district staff interviewed in the NW ESD 189 region indicated a need for training in screening and assessment procedures for bilingual and Native American pupils. This training would prepare staff to administer tests of language dominance, language proficiency, and special education eligibility. Respondents cited the use of instruments, like the LAS, for which district staff were not adequately trained. In other cases, interpreters were used to administer tests for which they had not been properly trained.

State-sponsored inservice training in appropriate assessment and identification procedures for bilingual, LEP, and Native American students would address this need. Small rural school districts with small but growing numbers of minority students are likely to be overlooked in directing inservice opportunities to regions of more obvious need (e.g., Yakima valley) with higher concentrations of minority students. Inservice topics suggested by this study would be:

- Appropriate tests and procedures for assessing language dominance and proficiency
- Alternative procedures for documenting special education eligibility
- Procedures for writing eligibility reports describing a pupil's actual level of functioning
- Standards for interpreter qualifications training in assessment, and special education and due process procedures
- District requirements for obtaining informed consent and other due process procedures

Recruitment and Training of Bilingual and Bicultural Staff

Many of the problems faced by the small rural districts in this study were related to the lack of bilingual and/or bicultural teaching staff. For example, interpreters who were not properly trained in test administration were used in districts to administer tests in the native language. In other districts, Native American liaisons without proper training in education procedures were used to obtain informed consent form Native American parents. A long-term statewide goal should be to recruit and train Hispanic and Native American teachers, instructional assistants, and related services staff.

The difficulty that small rural districts have in recruiting and maintaining bilingual educators who are imported from urban areas and universities are well documented. Serious consideration should be given to implementing career ladder training opportunities on-site in the districts needing bilingual and Native American staff.

APPENDIX B

Percent of Native American, Migrant, and Bilingual Students in Special Education

	School Districts							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
% of total enrollment in special education	9%	10%	8%	10%	16%	17%[2]	13%	11%
% of Native Americans in total enrollment	2%	12%	1%	1%	8%	32%	7%	unk.
% of Native Americans in special education	22%	13%	24%	33%	11%[1]	32%[3]	15%[5]	unk.
% of special education enrollment Native American	6%	16%	4%	3%	5%	60%	8%	6%
% of migrant in total enrollment	0	<1%	5%	3%	0	7%	0	2%
% of migrant in special education	0	0	3%	0	0	3%	0	21%
% of special education enrollment migrant	NA*	NA	2%	NA	NA	1%	NA	3%
% of bilingual/non-migrant in total enrollment	1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	0	0	<1%	<1%
% of bilingual/non-migrant in special education	3%	14%[4]	0	0	0	0	5%	0
% of special education bilingual/non-migrant	<1%	<1%	NA	NA	NA	NA	<1%	NA

*NA = not applicable in district

1 11 of 16 are in developmental preschool program on reservation; adjusted to 5 to exclude preschool age population.
2 14 students from out of district were excluded.
3 Includes preschool handicapped.
4 This is 1 student out of 7
5 11 of 97 are in developmental preschool program; adjusted to 86 to exclude preschool-aged populations.

APPENDIX C

Equity Project Bibliography

Anderson, P.P., & Schrag Fenichel, E. (1989). Serving culturally diverse families of infants and toddlers with disabilities. National Center for Clinical Infant Programs, 733 15th Street, N.W., Suite 912, Washington, D.C. 20005. (202)347-0308. Free copies available from the National Maternal and Child Health Clearinghouse, 38th and R Streets, N.W., Washington, DC 20057. (202)625-8410.

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (1986). Communication disorders in multicultural populations. Reading list on American Indian populations. ASHA, 10801 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20952.

Argulewicz, E.N. (1983). Effects of ethnic membership, socioeconomic status, and home language on LD, EMR, and EH placements. Learning Disability Quarterly, 6, 195-200.

Baca, L., & Bransford, J. (1982). An appropriate education for handicapped children of limited English proficiency. ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children, The Council for Exceptional Children, 1920 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091.

Baca, L.M., & Cervantes, H.T. (Eds.) (1984). The bilingual special education interface. St. Louis: Times Mirror/Mosby.

Baca, L. & Miramontes, O. (1985). Bilingual special education teacher training for American Indians. Journal of American Indian Education, 24, 38-47.

Baca, L., & Harris, K. (1988, Summer). Teaching migrant exceptional children. Teaching Exceptional Children, 20, 32-35.

Banks, J.A.(1987). Teaching strategies for ethnic studies. (4th Ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Barresi, J.G. (1982). Educating handicapped migrants: Issues and options. Exceptional Children, 48, 473-488.

Bergin, V. (1980). Special Education Needs in Bilingual Programs. Inter America Research Associates, Inc., National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Bill, W.E. (1987). From boarding schools to self determination. Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Old Capitol Building, GF-11, Olympia, WA 98504.

Bureau of Indian Affairs, Office of Indian Education Programs. (1989). Education Directory, Dept. of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Mail Stop 3512 MIB, 18th and C Streets, N.W., Washington, DC, 20245.

Bureau of Indian Affairs, Policies and Procedures Task Force. (First Ed. 1987).Bureau of Indian Affairs Special Education Rules and Regulations: A Resource Book. Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center, Utah State University, 1780 N. Research Parkway, Suite 112, Logan, UT 84321.

California State Dept. of Education (1986). Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students. Los Angeles: California State University, Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center.

Cegelka, P.T., Lewis, R., Rodriguez, A.M. (1987). Status of educational services to handicapped students with limited English proficiency: Report of a state-wide study in California. Exceptional Children, 54, 220-227.

Cegelka, P.T., et al. (1986). Educational services to handicapped students with limited English proficiency: A California statewide study. An ERIC Exceptional Child Education Report. ED 276 179, EC 190 945. CEC, Reston, VA.

Children's Defense Fund. (1990). Latino youths at a crossroads. CDF Publications, 122 C Street N.W., Washington, DC 20001. Copies available for $7.45.

Chinn, P.C., & Hughes, S. (1987). Representation of minority students in special education classes. Remedial and Special Education, 8, 41-46.

Chinn, P.C. (Ed.). (1984). Education of culturally and linguistically different exceptional children. CEC, ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicaps and Gifted Children, ED 256-103. Reston, VA.

Coburn, J., & Nelson, S. (1989). Teachers do make a difference: What Indian graduates say about their school experience. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 101 S.W. Main Street, Suite 500, Portland, OR 97204.

Comer, J.P. (1988). Educating poor minority children. Scientific American, 259, 42-48.

Committee on the Status of Racial Minorities. (1986). Communication disorders in multicultural populations: Reading list on American Indian populations. American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, 10801 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852.

Cooper, J.H. (1981). Planning for a culturally sensitive program. TADS, 500 NCNB Plaza, Chapel Hill, NC 27514.

Correa, V., & Ingram, T. (1984). Working with Mexican-American parents of young children with multiple handicaps and cultural implications. Available from authors, Box 4560, College of Education, Texas Technical University, Lubbock, TX 79409, (806) 742-2320.

Council for Exceptional Children. Ethnic and Multicultural Bulletin. CEC, 1920 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091-1589. (703)620-3660.

Cross, T.L. (1986). Gathering and sharing: An exploratory study of service delivery to emotionally handicapped Indian children. Northwest Indian Child Welfare Institute, Portland State University, P.O. Box 751, Portland, OR 97207-0751. (503)464-4040. Price is $4.50.

Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. Harvard Educational Review, 56, 18-36.

Cummins, J. (1984). Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Deal, V.R., & Yan, M.A. (1985). Resource guide to multicultural tests and materials. ASHA, June, 43-49.

Dew, N. (1984). The exceptional bilingual child: Demography. In P.C. Chinn (Ed.), Education of culturally and linguistically different exceptional children (pp. 1-41). Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Duran, R.P. (Ed.) 1981. Latino language and communicative behavior. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Duran, R., & Boeck, D. (1983). Migrant children with exceptional needs project report: Analysis of 1981-82 migrant handicapped child count. State of Washington, Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Edmonds, P., Martinson, S.A., & Goldberg, P.F. (1990). Demographics and cultural diversity in the 1990s. NEC * TAS and PACER Center, 4826 Chicago Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55417-1055.

Educational Testing Service. (1982). Tests appropriate for use with Native Americans. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Elmore, R.F. (1980). Backward mapping: Implementation research and policy decisions. Political Science Quarterly, 94, 601-616.

Erickson, J.G. & Omark, D.R. (Eds.). (1981). Communication Assessment of the Bilingual Bicultural Child. Baltimore: University Park Press.

Evans, J. (1981). Model preschool programs for handicapped bilingual children. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Lab. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EC 132 885).

Evard, B.L., & Sabers, D.L. (1979). Speech and language testing with distinct ethnic-racial groups: A survey of procedures for improving validity. Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 44, 271-281.

Exceptional Hispanic children and youth: Third annual symposium proceedings. (1985). Bueno Center for Multicultural Education, Monograph Series, Volume 6, Number 1. Education Building, Campus Box 249, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309.

Fifield, M. (1983). Improving the utilization and educational relevance of individual psychoeducational assessment reports in the placement of and IEP development for handicapped Native American children. Logan UT: Utah State University, Exceptional Child Center.

Finn, J. (1982). Patterns in special education placement as revealed by OCR survey. In K. Heller, W. Holtzman, and S. Messick (Eds.), Placement of children in special education: A strategy for equity (pp.322-381). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Figueroa, R.A., Sandoval, J., & Merino, B. (1984). School psychology and LEP children: New competencies. Journal of School Psychology, 22, 131-143.

Florida Department of Education. (1988). Involving minority and isolated parents in the education of their exceptional students. Clearinghouse/Information Center, Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students, Division of the Public Schools, Florida Department of Education, Knott Building, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0400.

Fradd, S.H., & Weismantel, M.J. (1989). Meeting the needs of culturally and linguistically different students: A handbook for educators. College-Hill Press Distribution Center, Order Department, 200 West St., Waltham, MA 02254. (800)342-9204. Price is $27.50.

Fradd, S.H., & Tikunoff, W.J. (Eds.). (1987). Bilingual education and bilingual special education: A guide for administrators. San Diego, CA: Little, Brown.

Gajar, A. (1985). American Indian personnel preparation in special education: Needs, program components, programs. Journal of American Indian Education, 24, 7-15.

Garcia, E.E. (1988). Attributes of effective schools for language minority students. Education and Urban Society, 20, 387-398.

Garcia, E.E. (1987/88). Effective schooling for language minority students. New Focus. National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 11501 Georgia Avenue, Wheaton, MD 20902. (800) 647-0123, (301)933-9448.

Garcia, E.E. (1987/88). Bilingual education in early childhood programs. Teacher Education and Practice, Fall/Winter, 31-46.

Garcia, E.E. (Ed.) (1983). The Mexican-American child. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University.

Gerston, R., Woodward, J., & Moore, L. (1988). Alternative educational models for language minority students: Research on structured immersion. Equity and Excellence, 23, 14-16.

Gollnick, D.M., & Chinn, P.C. (1983). Multicultural education in a pluralistic society. St. Louis, MO: C.V. Mosby Co.

Guidelines for services to students with limited English proficiency and special education needs in New York State. The State Education Department, Albany, NY 12234.

Hakuta, K., & Garcia, E.E. (1989). Bilingualism and education. American Psychologist, 44, 374-379.

Hicks, J. (1982). Serving preschool handicapped children of various cultures: An annotated bibliography. TADS, 500 NCNB Plaza, Chapel Hill, NC 27514. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No ED 224 226).

High, M.H., & Udall, A.J. (1983). Teacher ratings of students in relation to ethnicity of students and school ethnic balance. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 6, 154-166.

Hines, L.M. (1984). Multicultural concerns. In J.E. Ysseldyke (Ed.), School psychology: The state of the art. University of Minnesota: National School Psychology Inservice Training Network.

Hughes, D.M. (1980). Perceptions of parents, teachers, and administrators regarding procedures of the Individualized Educational Program in selected South Dakota schools. Dissertation Abstracts International, 41 (6), 2380A. (University Microfilms International No. 8025055).

Hynd, G.W., Quackenbush, R., Kramer, R., Conner, R., & Weed, W. (1980). Concurrent validity of the McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities with the Native American primary grade children. Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, 13, 29-34.

Interstate Migrant Council. (1984). National policy workshop on special education needs of migrant handicapped students: Proceedings report. Denver: Education Commission of the States.

Johnson, M.J., & Ramirez, B.A. (Eds.) (1987). American Indian exceptional children and youth. Council for Exceptional Children, Dept. C F 8 9 m , 1920 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091-1589. Price is $8.50.

Johnson, M.J., Ramirez, B.A., Trohanis, P.L., & Walker, J.L. (Eds.). (1980). Planning services for young handicapped American Indian and Alaska Native children. TADS, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 500 NCNB Plaza, Chapel Hill, NC 27514.

Journal of American Indian Education. Published by the Center for Indian Education, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287. (602)965-6292.

Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students. Published by Boise State University, 1910 University Drive, Education Building 215, Boise, ID 83725.

Kamphaus, R.W., & Lozano, R. (1984). Developing local norms for individually administered tests. School Psychology Review, 13, 491-498.

Kayser, H. (1989). Speech and language assessment of Spanish-English speaking children. Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 20, 226-244.

Kazimour, K.K., & Reschly, D.J. (1981). Investigation of the norms and concurrent validity for the Adaptive Behavior Inventory for Children (ABIC). American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 85, 512-520.

Landurand, P. (1981). Culturally responsive education: Where are we, where are we going, and how do we get there? Paper presented at the Council for Exceptional Children Conference on the Exceptional Bilingual Child, New Orleans.

Laosa, L.M. (1984). Social policies toward children of diverse ethnic, racial, and language groups in the United States. In H.W. Stevenson & A.E. Siegel (Eds.), Child development research and social policy (pp. 1-109). University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Larry P. Task Force. (1989). Larry P. Task Force Report: Policy and Alternative Assessment Guideline Recommendations. Resources in Special Education, 900 J. Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-2703.

Lenz, D. (1985). Working with cross-cultural and English-as-Second Language populations: Employment of paraprofessionals. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University, Institute for Human Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 260 875).

Lidz, C.S. (1983). Psychological assessment of the preschool disadvantaged child. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 219 912).

Malach, R.S. et al. (Eds.) (1987). A parents' guide to the BIA special education process. EPICS Project, P.O. Box 788, Bernalillo, NM 87004. (505)867-3396.

Meisels, S. J. Early identification of young handicapped children: A national bilingual standardization study of the Early Screening Inventory. University of Michigan, Center for Human Growth and Development, 300 North Ingalls, Ann Arbor, MI 48109.

More, A.J., & Oldridge, B. (1980). An approach to nondiscriminatory assessment of Native American children. B.C. Journal of Special Education, 4, 51-59.

Multicultural Leader. Editor and Publisher, Cherry A. McGee Banks. A quarterly newsletter published by Educational Materials & Services Center, 144 Railroad Avenue, Suite 107, Edmonds, WA 98020.

National Early Childhood Technical Assistance System (NEC*TAS). A Bibliography of Selected Resources on Cultural Diversity for Parents and Professionals Working with Young Children Who Have, or Are at Risk for, Disabilities. Available for $6.00 from PACER Center, 4826 Chicago Ave. South, Minneapolis, MN 55417-1055. (612)827-2966.

National Bilingual Education Clearinghouse, 1118 22nd St. N.W., Washington, DC 20037. (202)467-0867.

National Indian Education Association. (1977). Position paper. National Indian Education Association: Classification of handicapped children as it affects Indian children. Indian Education, 7, 1-3.

Northwest Indian Child Welfare Association, Inc. (1990). Honoring the children, NWICWA, c/o RRI, P.O. Box 751, Portland, OR 97207.

Northwest Indian Child Welfare Institute. (1987). Cross cultural skills in Indian child welfare: A guide for the non-Indian. Parry Center for Children, 3415 S.E. Powell Blvd., Portland, OR 97202.

Nuttall, E.V. & Landurand, P. (1984). A Study of Mainstreamed limited English proficient handicapped students in bilingual education. Wayland, MA: Vazquez-Nuttall, Inc.

O'Connell, J.C. (Ed.). A study of the special education problems and needs of American Indians with handicaps both on and off the reservation. Northern Arizona University, Native American Research and Training Center, Box 5630, Flagstaff, AZ 86011, and University of Arizona, Native American Research and Training Center, 1642 E. Helen Street, Tucson, AZ 85719.

Oakland, U. (1982). Nonbiased assessment of minority group children. In J.T. Neisworth (Ed.), Assessment in Special Education (pp.147-162). Rockville, MD: Aspen Publications.

Ochoa, A.M., & Hurtado, J. (Eds.). Special education and the bilingual child. San Diego: National Origin Desegregation Lau Center, San Diego State University.

Olion, L., & Gillis-Olion, M. (1984). Assessing culturally diverse exceptional children. Early Child Development and Care, 15, 203-231.

Omark, D.R. & Erickson, J.G. (Eds.). (1983). The Bilingual Exceptional Child. San Diego: College-Hill Press.

Ortiz, A.A., & Ramirez, B.A. (Eds.). (1988). Schools and the culturally diverse exceptional student. ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children, Reston, VA 22091.

Ortiz, A. & Yates, J.R. (1983). Incidence of exceptionality among Hispanics: Implications for manpower planning. National Association of Bilingual Education Journal, 7, 41-53.

Pallas, A.M., Natriello, G., & McDill, E.L. (1989). The changing nature of the disadvantaged population: Current dimensions and future trends. Educational Researcher, 18, 16-22.

Pepper, F.C. (1985). Effective practices in Indian education: A teacher's monograph. Portland, OR: Research and Development for Indian Education, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Perlman, R., & Chamberlain, P. (1988). Interpreters and the assessment of language minority students for special education placement: Training implications. Counterpoint, 9, 14.

Plata, M. (1982). Assessment, placement, and programming of bilingual exceptional pupils: A practical approach. ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children, ED 224-267. CEC, Publication Sales, 1920 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091.

Powell, Yamamoto, Romero, & Morales (1983). The psychosocial development of minority group children. New York: Brunner/Mazel.

A Profile of Chicano Children in Poverty 0-6 Years of Age. Prepared by Alliance for Children, Youth, and Families and Washington State Migrant Council. Atlantic Street Center, 2103 S. Atlantic Street, Seattle, WA 98144. (206)329-2050.

Ramirez, J.D. (1986). Comparing structural English immersion and bilingual education: First-year results of a national study. American Journal of Education, 95, 122-128.

Reetz, L., & Cerny, M. (1988). ACRES cross-cultural bibliography for rural special educators. American Council on Rural Special Education (ACRES), Miller Hall 359, Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA 98225.

Reschly, D.J. (1981). Evaluation of the effects of SOMPA measures on classification of students as mildly mentally retarded. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 86, 16-20.

Reschly, D.J. (1978). WISC-R factor structures among Anglos, Blacks, Chicanos, and Native-American Papagos. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46, 417-422.

Research and Resources on Special Education. (August 1989). Assessing the language difficulties of Hispanic bilingual students. Abstract 23. ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children. The Council for Exceptional Children, 1920 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091.

Research and Resources on Special Education. (October 1988). Assessment and education of young Hispanic children with deafness. Abstract 20. ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children. The Council for Exceptional Children, 1920 Association Drive, Reston, VA, 22091.

Rivera, C. (Ed.) (1983). An ethnographic/sociolinguistic approach to language proficiency assessment (Multilingual Matters, Vol. 8). Rosslyn, VA: Interamerican Research Associates.

Rodriguez, R.F. (1982). The Mexican American child in special education. Educational Resources Information Center, Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools (CRESS), New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM 88003.

Ruiz, N. (1988). The nature of bilingualism: Implications for special education. Resources in Special Education, 900 J Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-2702. (916)442-7391. Price is $10.00.

Rural Special Education Quarterly (1986). Topical issue: Serving cross-cultural populations. Volume 8, Number 1. To request copies: National Rural Development Institute, Miller Hall 359, Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA 98225.

Stuecher, U. (1985). Training project for Indian school liaison and support personnel in special education. Journal of American Indian Education, 24, 9-19.

Sue, S. (1988). Sociocultural issues in the assessment and classroom teaching of language minority students. Resources in Special Education, 900 J Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-2703. (916)442-7391.

Telzrow, C.F. (1985). Best practices in reducing error in learning disability qualification. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), Best practices in school psychology, (pp. 431-446). Kent, OH: The National Association of School Psychologists.

Trueba, H.T. (1988). Culturally based explanations of minority students' academic achievement. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 19, 270-287.

Tucker, J.A. (1980). Nineteen Steps for assuring nonbiased placement of students in special education. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

U.S. General Accounting Office. (1990). Special Education: Estimates of Handicapped Indian Preschoolers and Sufficiency of Services. (HRD-90-61BR). Washington, DC.

Valencia, R.R., & Rankin, R.J. (1986). Factor analysis of the K-ABC for groups of Anglo and Mexican American children. Journal of Educational Measurement, 23, 209-219.

Vasquez-Chairez, M. (1988). Bilingual and special education: Procedural manual for program administrators. Resources in Special Education, 900 J Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-2703.

Vaughn-Cooke, F.B. (1983). Improving language assessment in minority children. ASHA, 25, 29-34.

Willis, R.L. (1984). The Special Education resource room versus full-time regular class placement: A comparison of two mainstreaming options for Native American Learning Disabled Students. Dissertation Abstracts International, 46(3), 697A-698A. (University Microfilms International No. DA 8510994).

Other Bibliographies

Native American Research and Training Center
Northern Arizona University
NAU Box 5630
Flagstaff, AZ 86011

Under the auspices of a federal grant, the following annotated bibliographies were produced by staff of the Native American Research and Training Center, under the direction of Joanne Curry O'Connell and Marilyn J. Johnson:

No. 1 Assessment issues
No. 2 Rehabilitation issues
No. 3 Special education issues
No. 4 Family issues
No. 5 Mental health issues
No. 6 Health care issues
No. 7 Medically related disability issues

National Early Childhood Technical Assistance System (NECTAS)
CB #8040
Suite 500 NCNB Plaza
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-8040
(919) 962-2001

A Bibliography of Selected Resources on Cultural Diversity
For parents and professionals working with young children who have, or are at risk for, disabilities. 1989.

This bibliography is divided into two sections. The first section contains general references on cultural diversity. The second section contains bibliographic materials on the following populations:

Asian
Black
Hispanic
Native American/Alaska Native

Each section includes information on printed materials and on organizations/resources.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Handicapped and Gifted Children
Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091-1589
(703) 620-3660

Identification and assessment of exceptional bilingual students (Computer search reprint). (1988, May). (Stock No. 568).

American Council on Rural Special Education (ACRES)
National Rural Development Institute
Western Washington University
Miller Hall 359
Bellingham, WA 98225
(706) 676-3576

ACRES cross-cultural bibliography for rural special educators (1988, February). Bellingham, WA: National Rural Development Institute.

Other Resources

The Educational Materials and Services Center
144 Railroad Avenue, Suite 107
Edmonds, WA 98020

The EMSC works with educators and other professionals to:
- Improve academic achievement for all students
- Implement strategies for prejudice reduction
- Develop skills and knowledge in the area of multicultural education
- Maximize equality of opportunity for all groups
- Improve students' self-concepts
- Find positive solutions to the educational challenges of diversity

EMSC offers training, publications, research assistance, resource materials, curriculum development, and consultant services. For information contact Cherry A. McGee Banks (206)775-3582.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.
ERIC/CRESS
Box 3AP
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003-0042.
(505)646-2623.

Published the Directory of organizations and activities in American Indian Education.

National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education
1300 Wilson Boulevard
Suite B2-11
Rosslyn, VA 22209

Publishes a monthly series of papers, FOCUS, and a quarterly newsletter, FORUM.

National Association of Bilingual Education
1201 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202)822-7870

Publishes the National Association of Bilingual Education Journal.

Asian Bilingual Cross-Cultural Material Development Center
615 Grant Ave., 2nd Floor

San Francisco, CA 94108
(415) 494-2472

Bilingual Education Service Center
500 South Dwyer Ave.
Arlington Heights, IL 60005

National Assessment and Dissemination Center
49 Washington Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02140
(617) 492-0505

Native American Research and Training Center
Northern Arizona University
NAU Box 5630
Flagstaff, AZ 86011

National Advisory Council on Indian Education
2000 L Street NW, Suite 574
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 634-6160

Bureau of Indian Affairs Advisory Committee
for Exceptional Children
1951 Constitution Avenue, Room 4244
Washington, DC 20245
(202) 343-6675

EPICS Project
Southwest Communication Resources
P.O. Box 788
Bernalillo, NM 87004
(505) 867-3396

The EPICS Project provides materials and resources for the parents of Indian children with special needs. The EPICS Messenger is a newsletter for parents of Native American children which includes related articles and a calendar of upcoming events.

Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center
1780 North Research Parkway, Suite 112

Logan, UT 84321
(801) 752-0238

The Mountain Plains Resource Center is a resource for state agencies and professionals working with Native American families and the BIA.

APPENDIX D

Informants	(1) a) Tests for dominant language? b) Bilingual screening? c) Given by professional fluent in child's language?	(2) Tests for special ed. placement to establish language competency given in both languages?	(3) a) Interpreter to screen/assess? b) Training for interpreters? c) Interpreter literate?	(4) a) Informed consent from non-English speaking parents? b) Due process forms mailed? c) Similar for migrant & NA?	(5) Assessment for preschool LEP special ed. candidates?	(6) Place LEP students in special ed. due to lack of other options?
Special Ed. Staff District 81	a) LAS b) LAS We are aware of the limits of this measure. c) By trained ESL aides or the migrant coop coordinator. They speak Spanish. We don't have Asian speakers.	Process is: 1) Consult with migrant coord. 2) Obtain LAS results. 3) Review history and rate of progress in current program. 4) If program is appropriate, use non-verbal test. 5) Academic tests in Spanish or English.	a) No. This is unfortunate but there is a low referral rate. Inappropriate to use interpreter: risk of changing test in terms of measurement.	a) Obtain by having a translator present for Spanish and Cambodian. b) Yes. For Spanish families. c) Same procedure.	No response.	No response.

Informants	(7) Reporting migrant students to special education?	(8) Training of special education staff.	(9) a) Special ed. eligibility based on professional judgment? b) Rationale.	(10) a) Parent participating in IEP? b) How frequent? c) Accommodations.	(11) Unique problems and solutions.
Special Ed. Staff District 81 (cont.)	All students reported to special ed. office. Migrant included in counting and reporting as required.	School psychologist has attended workshops. Psychologist as team leader consults with migrant coordinator on appropriate course of action.	a) No migrants at this time have been qualified on professional judgment. Has been used in past to remove identified students or not qualify referred students. Have 1 NA in special ed. based on professional judgment. b) Make home visits to obtain history, parents' view of child, and parent desires. Also meet at school. Or school psychologist meets with migrant coordinator if no home or school visit is possible. Look at multiple school placements, absenteeism, family history.	a) Yes. Every effort is made to include them. c) In one case a home visit was made.	No response.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Informants	(1) a) Tests for dominant language? b) Bilingual screening? c) Given by professional fluent in child's language?	(2) Tests for special ed. placement to establish language competency given in both languages?	(3) a) Interpreter to screen/assess? b) Training for interpreters? c) Interpreter literate?	(4) a) Informed consent from non-English speaking parents? b) Due process forms mailed? c) Similar for migrant & MA?	(5) Assessment for preschool LEP special ed. candidates?	(6) Place LEP students in special ed. due to lack of other options?
Special Ed. Staff District 01	a) LAS b) LAS We are aware of the limits of this measure. c) By trained ESL aides or the migrant coop coordinator. They speak Spanish. We don't have Asian speakers.	Process is: 1) Consult with migrant coord. 2) Obtain LAS results. 3) Review history and rate of progress in current program. 4) If program is appropriate, use non-verbal test. 5) Academic tests in Spanish or English.	a) No. This is unfortunate but there is a low referral rate. Inappropriate to use interpreter: risk of changing test in terms of measurement.	a) Obtain by having a translator present for Spanish and Cambodian. b) Yes. For Spanish families. c) Same procedure.	No response.	No response.

Informants	(7) Reporting migrant students to special education?	(8) Training of special education staff.	(9) a) Special ed. eligibility based on professional judgment? b) Rationale.	(10) a) Parent participating in IEP? b) How frequent? c) Accommodations.	(11) Unique problems and solutions.
Special Ed. Staff District 01 (cont.)	All students reported to special ed. office. Migrant included in counting and reporting as required.	School psychologist has attended workshops. Psychologist as team leader consults with migrant coordinator on appropriate course of action.	a) No migrants at this time have been qualified on professional judgment. Has been used in past to remove identified students or not qualify referred students. Have 1 MA in special ed. based on professional judgment. b) Make home visits to obtain history, parents' view of child, and parent desires. Also meet at school. Or school psychologist meets with migrant coordinator if no home or school visit is possible. Look at multiple school placements, absenteeism, family history.	a) Yes. Every effort is made to include them. c) In one case a home visit was made.	No response.

Informants	(1) a) Tests for dominant language? b) Bilingual screening? c) Given by professional fluent in child's language?	(2) Tests for special ed. placement to establish language competency given in both languages?	(3) a) Interpreter to screen/assess? b) Training for interpreters? c) Interpreter literate?	(4) a) Informed consent from non-English speaking parents? b) Due process forms mailed? c) Similar for migrant & NA?	(5) Assessment for preschool LEP special ed. candidates?	(6) Place LEP students in special ed. due to lack of other options?
Administrator District 82	a) (Referred to staff.) b) Yes. c) Administered by professional who is bilingual.	Screen for language, cultural, and environmental background before referral to special ed.	a) 4 people serve as interpreters (teacher and 3 aides). b) Literate in Spanish.	a) Contacted by home visits. c) Same for NA.	Teacher goes to migrant camps before school. After screening children are referred for school-based assessment.	Never.
Psychologist District 82	a) Child study team. b) No screening tool in special ed. c) Don't know about training staff have received, but they are very experienced.		a) Yes. Migrant ed. staff. Meet with interpreter prior to meeting to discuss content. b) Trained in migrant program. c) All are Hispanic.	a) Psychologist discusses with parents using interpreter and then both go to home. b) Nothing is mailed. c) Not many NA.	Referral is made then screening at home. Assess at school using K-ABC, Vineland, OT/PT. Then MDT meeting.	I am not aware of that ever happening.
Teacher's Aide District 82	a) LAS and DISTAR language test. b) WRAT for quick screen. c) Certified teacher does all testing.	Usually not given in both languages.	a) Usually not for special ed. Interpreters don't do testing, they just interpret for parents.	a) I go to the home and tell the parents about the forms. I always go with a special ed. teacher, never alone. I go to translate.		Migrant teacher makes sure that only handicapped are placed in special ed.
Parent District 82	Not asked.	They give tests in both languages. I'm not sure about special ed.	Don't know.	a) Home visitor goes to home to explain.	Not asked.	I don't think so.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Informants	(7) Reporting migrant students to special education?	(8) Training of special education staff.	(9) a) Special ed. eligibility based on professional judgement? b) Rationale.	(10) a) Parent participating in IEP? b) How frequent? c) Accommodations.	(11) Unique problems and solutions.
Administrator District 82 (cont.)	Through MSRIS. Records clerk assists migrant teacher.	No special training because there are so few in special ed.	a) Almost never. Have probably never placed a migrant student in BD category. That relies too heavily on professional judgement. b) Psychologists have a specific procedure.	a) Yes. We are quite persistent. c) High school is hardest. NA parents more likely to require home visit. Migrant parents generally always come to school.	1) Funds. Resources are being reduced. 2) Drop-outs. It varies from family to family with the NA students. The percentages look fine but they do not tell the full story. NA with tribal affiliations are at greater risk. Migrant drop-out rate is probably significant too. 3) Structure. Our K-8 structure allows us to keep middle school numbers down in each school. Less like high school. Closer relationships with teachers and greater opportunity for participation in activities. 4) Culture. I wonder if they are true cultural differences or just a matter of being adrift in our society. 5) Coordination with tribe. Only passing attempts at contacts with tribal leaders. 6) Singling out NA students. Adolescent NA students don't want to be singled out. Young ones like special attention. Not necessarily a cultural issue.
Psychologist District 82 (cont.)	Migrant teacher reports to special ed. office.	SOMPA (System of Multicultural Pluralistic Assessment) training.	a) If child really fails dismally in migrant program we may refer to special ed. I can only think of 2 in 8 years. b) Vineland, home visit, questionnaires, reports.	a) Not all attend. Always invited. b) Majority come to school. No difference in participation compared to other families. c) We go on home visits and arrange for interpreters when needed.	1) Parents agree too easily. They feel we are the experts and agree with whatever we think is best. I don't feel comfortable with that. 2) Successful accommodations. Going to their home, having very few people at meetings. It is important to be human and not arrogant.
Teacher's Aide District 82 (cont.)	I don't know. But in one case we were notified immediately about a severely handicapped boy.	I don't know.	a) None right now. b) Migrant teacher assists staff with rationale question.	a) Parents are always involved. c) I translate in the home or at school.	1) Parent participation. Lower among migrant than among bilingual or Anglo. 2) Attendance & drop-outs. Attendance for younger children is fine. In higher grades, more absenteeism especially for those with learning problems. Drop-out rate is higher for migrant students in my opinion.
Parent District 82 (cont.)		Teachers' aides in migrant program go to workshops.	Not asked.	a) Yes. c) Interpreters and transportation are provided.	1) Drop-outs. Both of my children dropped out. I got her GED, however. 2) Migrant Council. Meets once/month instead of required 4/year. 3) Medical services. Migrant program has funds to pay for needed services. 4) Migrant program. Did not have enough space before. Now we have a trailer.

Informants	(1) a) Tests for dominant language? b) Bilingual screening? c) Given by professional fluent in child's language?	(2) Tests for special ed. placement to establish language competency given in both languages?	(3) a) Interpreter to screen/assess? b) Training for interpreters? c) Interpreter literate?	(4) a) Informed consent from non-English speaking parents? b) Due process forms mailed? c) Similar for migrant & NA?	(5) Assessment for preschool LEP special ed. candidates?	(6) Place LEP students in special ed. due to lack of other options?
Administrator District 03	a) We use the LAS. Same used by ESL program. c) Given by fluent Hispanic bilingual/bicultural staff.	No, not routinely, but sometimes. It's a judgment call.	a) Yes. Interpreter used in both screening and assessment. b) Trained by school psychologist. c) Always literate.	a) For LEP, migrant home visitor goes with staff to obtain consent. b) Due process forms mailed to NA parents since they speak English.	We contract with a private agency for preschool services and I don't know what they do.	No. There are so many other programs that it is not a problem.
Administrator District 03	a) HLS (Home Language Survey) first to determine language spoken at home. Then LAS. c) Given by fluent Spanish speakers.	Woodcock-Johnson is given in both Spanish and English.	Didn't answer.	a) Migrant records clerk is frequently used. In one case of SBD, Hispanic Mental Health helped, also ESD staff. b) Never.	Don't know.	No. Always go to home and spend personal time with the student. Faculty doesn't over-refer.
Teacher District 03	a) Las; Pre-LAS for ages 4-6. b) Yes.	Tough one. I always do both English and Spanish LAS. Woodcock-Johnson Spanish version is supposed to be invalid. Sometimes questions are not in my language or child's language so I have to change them.	a) Bilingual instructional aides are used sometimes. Usually, certified bilingual teacher. c) Literate.	a) I went to a home with the special ed. teacher once to obtain permission and get developmental history. Parent comes to school where test results are scored.	I don't know.	Yes, I think so, but not since I've been here (2 years). I wonder, even now, when kids are referred if it's because there is a problem getting other services.
Teacher District 03	a) LAS c) May be given by teachers who are not bilingual at other schools. I'm not sure.	No. Not routinely.	a) On occasion an aide who may not be very knowledgeable is used. b) No formal training. c) Not always.	b) Sometimes forms are mailed. They are written in English with a note in Spanish saying to please sign and return. I requested that someone go to the home and explain the forms.	I have no idea.	Trying hard to find other options. We don't have a bilingual program, just ESL.
Teacher's Aide District 03	a) LAS is used for screening. c) Some aides administer LAS English version and they are not bilingual. All who use the Spanish version have had extensive training.	They are trying to do that now. They use bilingual aides who are very thorough.	We send Spanish speaking (only) parents to the school where there are 2 bilingual teachers who are literate.	a) I used to take forms out to parents but now I insist that a special ed. representative come along. b) We never mail forms.	I didn't know until 2 weeks ago that parents could request preschool services for handicapped children. A migrant family from Texas told me about it.	No. Never. I can tell which Hispanic kids are handicapped. The district does a good job with assessment and proper placement.
Administrator, Other Agency District 03	a) I don't know. b) I believe a trained professional is used for screening bilingual children.	I don't know.	a) Interpreters always used if necessary. b) Trained by migrant ed. staff in district. c) Fluent speakers and also literate.	Home visits by bilingual staff or parent is asked to come to school. They contact us for transportation.	Not asked.	Not that I know of.

District 83 (cont.)

Informants	(7) Reporting migrant students to special education?	(8) Training of special education staff.	(9) a) Special ed. eligibility based on professional judgment? b) Rationale.	(10) a) Parent participating in IEP? b) How frequent? c) Accommodations.	(11) Unique problems and solutions.
Administrator District 83 (cont.)	I don't know how a child becomes eligible under federal migrant regs. - so, no.	ESD 189 inservice, multicultural special ed. conference, although it's not required. Special training rare.	a) No more frequently than any where else. Rarely. b) We look at siblings and the parents view of target child v. other children in family. Also look at peer group. Economic is hardest to rule out.	a) LEP parents always invited. Difficult to get them to school. c) We go to the home with the migrant visitor.	1) Knowledge of culture. Materials are scarce. Conferences are few. 2) Drop-out rate. I would guess it is high.
Administrator District 83 (cont.)	I call MSRTS myself. Data should be on MSRTS form.	Not asked.	b) If Spanish version is administered correctly, then cultural causes are ruled out according to our psychologist. Hard to rule out environmental and economic factors. Qualification boils down to teacher and psychologist's judgment in the case where no instruments can be administered.	a) Did not answer. b) Did not answer. c) Have bilingual staff to interpret for parents.	1) Parent expectations. Parents have unreal expectations of what schools can do. 2) Migrant program. Migrant program needs more outreach support. Need records clerk and home visitor to be 2 separate staff. 3) Attendance. This is the biggest problem. 4) Secondary programs. We have a computer ed. program that serves ESL, migrant, and LAP. Students go through counseling, tutorial and testing, and then are funnelled into ESL, LAP, or both. Computer program links to CC and VTI. 5) Spanish classes. District provides Spanish classes after school for staff. 6) MSRTS. Staff nationwide don't contribute data. Lose a lot of time tracking information down.
Teacher District 83 (cont.)	MSRTS files are incomplete so often. MSRTS files are late. Sometimes takes weeks for files to get to the right school.	I don't know of any.	Don't know.	I imagine they do, but I have never been invited to sit in on an IEP meeting. Some of the parents don't speak English. I don't know why I haven't been included.	1) Assessment. I don't think the special ed. staff are qualified to assess the LEP students. The process is in need of help. 2) Role of migrant teachers. The bilingual teacher is expected to do everything for these kids: when they are sick we take them home. I had to go to homes to check everyone's migration status for a field trip to Canada. It was embarrassing. 3) Translations. District doesn't translate anything; report cards, teacher notes, school nurse, etc. I have to translate all of it. 4) Program improvement. Attempts to improve things but with the increase in the population we need more bilingual staff. We have no secretarial support. I have to go to the office supply store to buy materials. There is no support for ordering materials.
Teacher District 83 (cont.)	They are not reported to us right away. We have to do the tracking ourselves.	I don't know.	The tendency is to look for options other than special ed. first.	I don't know.	Appropriate programs. If you qualify a child for special ed., there is no one there to serve them. No special ed. staff speak Spanish.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Informants	(7) Reporting migrant students to special education?	(8) Training of special education staff.	(9) a) Special ed. eligibility based on professional judgment? b) Rationale.	(10) a) Parent participating in IEP? b) How frequent? c) Accommodations.	(11) Unique problems and solutions.
Teacher's Aide District 83 (cont.)	If parents have the papers, I notify special ed. immediately. MSRTS is incomplete. It is so much work.	None that I know of.	Not asked.	a) Very few come to the schools. I would like to bring the parents to IEP meetings at the school, just like they do for Anglo kids where everyone sits together and talks about the child's progress. I would like to bring parents in before I go out to the home with the IEP by myself.	1) Regular programs and teachers need to take responsibility. If a child is sick, they call me (even at home) to take the child home. Migrant kids that are fluent in English get sent to the migrant program at the high school. Some of them hate to go there. The regular counselor should be helping them, too. The school people just don't understand that they should be treated like everyone else. 2) Parent participation at school. The house is not a good place to hold IEP meetings. Parents are uncomfortable; the TV is on.
Administrator, Other Agency District 83 (cont.)	MSRTS has information on student's special ed. status. Teachers receive it from school administration offices.	I have heard that they receive training.	a) I don't know the percentages but I would say, not often. The migrant population is not over-represented in special ed. as far as I know.	a) Involved in the assessment process. I don't think they are involved in IEP planning since so many have such little education. Home visitor goes to home (perhaps with staff person) or letter mailed in English or Spanish.	1) Bilingual/non-migrant. There is a problem here. Also a problem with illegal aliens who are not eligible for special programs. 2) Funding. Programs are underfunded, especially in the critical area of working directly with the child. 3) HEP. Hispanic Education Program at WSU provides 8 week GED preparation. It is very successful.

Informants	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	a) Tests for dominant language? b) Bilingual screening? c) Given by professional fluent in child's language?	Tests for special ed. placement to establish language competency given in both languages?	a) Interpreter to screen/assess? b) Training for interpreters? c) Interpreter literate?	a) Informed consent from non-English speaking parents? b) Due process forms mailed? c) Similar for migrant & NA?	Assessment for preschool LEP special ed. candidates?	Place LEP students in special ed. due to lack of other options?
Administrator District 84	c) We find it best to use a certified teacher for screening and testing.	We have never had a need. If we did we would call ESD 189 as a resource.	a) Teacher on staff is our interpreter for Spanish. Had to find Asian interpreter for the 2 Asian students.	(Referred to staff to answer.)	No one is actively pursuing LEP preschoolers.	No. If placed in special ed. they have met the criteria.
Administrator District 84	a) Have Language Survey and LAS. b) Yes. c) Yes. Trained, bilingual professionals.	I don't know. Don't think any of our special ed. students are migrant or bilingual.	a) Teacher on staff is bilingual. c) She is literate in Spanish.	a) Teacher that does testing goes to home or talks to parents when they come in. b) Yes. Due process is mailed. c) No. No need for interpreter for NA.	Use test developed in district. Results form basis for referral to CHI, K, or special ed.	No LEP students in special ed. due to language problems.
Teacher's Aide District 84	b) LAS c) Certified teacher that speaks Spanish.	Don't know.	a) Both teacher and I are bilingual. Teacher and ESD person do all screening and assessment. c) Yes.	a) We call or visit or send a letter. Teacher is bilingual.	Don't know of any LEP in special ed. Have test for migrant.	No. Not ever. We have a bilingual resource room if needed (non-special ed.).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Informants	(7) Reporting migrant students to special education?	(8) Training of special education staff.	(9) a) Special ed. eligibility based on professional judgment? b) Rationale.	(10) a) Parent participating in IEP? b) How frequent? c) Accomodations.	(11) Unique problems and solutions.
Administrator District 84 (cont.)	No children in migrant program are eligible.	No specialized training. No requests for training.	a) Only 3 of 30-40 identified by tribe have been placed. Partly because only a few of those screened were assessed. Parents often miss the scheduled evaluations at the reservation.	c) We don't ever need interpreters because we have certified staff and aides that are bilingual. Regulations regarding IEPs always followed.	1) Native American students. We have a problem matching services with the unique needs of NA students. Drop-outs are frequent. Some antagonism from tribe plus administrative turnover. All may be slow in recognizing cultural differences. Tribe perceives that their needs have been set aside. Funding restricts our efforts. We may be able to access more funds from the tribe to benefit our students. 2) Migrant. Limited funds which do not support consistent training. Have asked ESD 189 for a process or direction. I suspect we still don't have much in place through 189 coop due to limited funds. We have to rely on our own staff and staff from Burlington. Students' entering and leaving is unpredictable. 3) Preschool. Only 3 have been identified. Parents don't show up for scheduled meetings on reservation. Disagreement over location. To isolate students on reservation is not a good idea according to another director. We want to blend the programs.
Administrator District 84 (cont.)	All records are in special ed. office. New parents are asked if child has been in special ed.	None that I know of.	a) Pretty rare. Can't think of a single instance. b) Our standardized tests impose cultural factors. We have 2 NA in special ed. at Middle School. Our psychologist looks at whole child and beyond scores.	a) Yes. b) They all attend IEP meetings. c) We will go to the home or the reservation. Have teacher and student to interpret at Middle School.	1) Native Americans. These students don't like to be singled out. So we have tutors that go into class with them. Have incredible absenteeism among some NA students. 2) Non-English speaking, non-migrant. We don't have resources to serve these children. We send these students to a bilingual program in another district. 3) Drop-outs. NAs tend to drop out at Middle School. More of an issue in high school because of earned credit system. I have recommended retention. Teachers feel if students came to school they would do well. Those living off reservation attend better. 4) Qualified tutors. Tribe wants a NA tutor but we can't find one. Who would pay them? Are they qualified?
Teacher's Aide District 84 (cont.)	School office always calls for info. from sending school. Call MSRTS. School psychologist does reporting.	No special training.	a) Don't know. NA special ed. are mostly slow learners or BD. b) Not a problem since no one is placed on professional judgment.	a) Yes. c) If they don't come in we go to their house. I go if they don't speak English.	Native American and migrant students in special ed. are slow at learning and don't retain well. School is teaching cultural awareness; it's built into the curriculum.

Informants	(8) Training of special education staff.	(9) a) Special ed. eligibility based on professional judgement? b) Rationale.	(10) a) Parent participating in IEP? b) How frequent? c) Accommodations.	(11) Unique problems and solutions.
Parent/Teacher's Aide District 04 Tribal Educator District 04	No training. Teachers are starting to call JOM coord. when they see a child with a problem.	Not sure of assessment process but see that it is difficult for NA to qualify. Tendency is to let them fall through cracks and deny service rather than over-refer.	a) Yes. Especially at grade school level. c) Efforts to include parents are not made. She receives IEP in mail. Never asked to attend meeting. JOM coord. never asked to help. She can provide rides, etc. Better to hold IEP at Tribal Center.	1) Liaison. Having JOM coord. serve as liaison between the tribe and the school has really helped. Works with students, parents, and teachers. Observes classes on request of student or parent. Arranges meetings with teacher, student, and parent. Keeps track of attendance for courts. Helps find alternative programs. Needs to be a cooperative effort. Sometimes liaison is viewed as policeman rather than a member of the team. 2) Drop-outs. This is a big problem. Tend to drop out between junior high and high school. Only 2 graduated last year. District targets junior high for district-based JOM services. Tribe wants to focus on earlier grades. Tribe did not sign-off on district JOM plan. Open-forum was not held for tribal input. 3) Parent involvement. Parents not informed of their rights in the past. Did not know they could ask questions. 4) Transition to K. Preschool teacher at tribal school helps prepare parents for K. School district has never done Childfind on reservation. Preschool did 2 Childfinds but placement took a long time.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Informants	(1) a) Tests for dominant language? b) Bilingual screening? c) Given by professional fluent in child's language?	(2) Tests for special ed. placement to establish language competency given in both languages?	(3) a) Interpreter to screen/assess? b) Training for interpreters? c) Interpreter literate?	(4) a) Informed consent from non-English speaking parents? b) Due process forms mailed? c) Similar for migrant & NA?	(5) Assessment for preschool LEP special ed. candidates?	(6) Place LEP students in special ed. due to lack of other options?
Administrator District 85	a) LAS c) CDS always administers test.	Yes if child is not fluent in English.	a) CDS, ESL, and 1 special ed. teacher speak Spanish. c) Both teachers are literate.	a) Forms in Spanish but the parents have always understood English so we never need to use them. We can use interpreters too. c) For NA we sometimes use NA staff. We don't need to go to the home.	Don't know.	No. Never.
Psychologists District 85	c) CDS does this. Psychologist has only assessed 1 LEP student this year.	No.			Have not needed to assess LEP. All have spoken English.	No. We have a program at 1 elementary that allows us to serve children without labeling them.

Informants	(7) Reporting migrant students to special education?	(8) Training of special education staff.	(9) a) Special ed. eligibility based on professional judgment? b) Rationale.	(10) a) Parent participating in IEP? b) How frequent? c) Accommodations.	(11) Unique problems and solutions.
Administrator District 85 (cont.)	The special programs director does reporting.	Each year for LEP, 1 staff attends bilingual conference. Don't know of any training re: assessment of NA or migrant.	a) Don't know. Maybe 4 times per year. b) Adaptive behavior is considered, and must fall in normal age range.	a) Difficult to get parents to come to meetings. c) Teachers go to tribal center, but parents don't come. Also schedule meetings late in day or evenings. Tribe doesn't want school staff coming to reservation.	1) Parent involvement. Difficult to get parents involved. We have made attempts but so far are unsuccessful. 2) Tardiness. NA students are tardy. We offer program changes, like voc. ed. We have a procedure to deal with absences: 4 days missed - we call home and send letter (NA coord. calls parent); 8 days missed and 10 days we call and write again; 11 days missed we have a HDT.
Psychologists District 85 (cont.)	Special ed. director.	Attend workshops on minority assessment.	a) Not used. b) Sometimes children have serious perceptual problems or come from tribal special ed. Economic factors hardest to rule out. Refer to "primary causal" factor.	a) NA involved at primary level. c) Indian education advocates sometimes help us.	1) Tribal school. Students bounce back and forth. 1st graders not well prepared for school. Emphasis is on cultural values, not academics in preschool. 2) Drop-outs. Drop-out rate for NA is astronomical. Hard to calculate because students drop and return several times. 3) Coordination with tribe. We have tried to coordinate unsuccessfully. We get pot-shots from NA educators at meetings. Tribe seems to value education less. We have NA study centers at secondary schools. When we make efforts to make liaisons with tribe we are often rebuffed.

Informants	(8) Training of special education staff.	(9) a) Special ed. eligibility based on professional judgment? b) Rationale.	(10) a) Parent participating in IEP? b) How frequent? c) Accommodations.	(11) Unique problems and solutions.
Administrator District 85	Special ed. directors have provided special workshops on assessment for minority students.	a) That wouldn't happen because we have program options available for children who are not labeled. We don't like to label kids. b) Hard to rule them out entirely. We can serve even without a label so we have options other than special ed. placement.	a) We have the same expectations for NA that we have for other parents. c) We will go to their homes or they come here.	1) Cultural differences. We make accommodations, e.g., help NA children develop leadership in small groups rather than large groups. We make sure students know they are respected, they are as important as everyone else, and their families are welcome here. 2) NA students. They are well behaved, love to be here. Come in early and stay late for extra help.
Elementary Teacher District 85	Not aware of training at district level. Have 1-day visit to reservation for new teachers.	a) School psychologist is very good at interpreting scores. Sometimes CHI is easier for parents to accept than special ed.	a) Not as involved as we would like in general. c) Use written communication and work with JOM coordinator. Very painful process for parents.	1) Parent involvement. Ongoing problem. Have to make a personal commitment. Personal contact is most effective, better than letters. There is always a way to get them involved. You just have to make the effort. 2) Field trip to reservation. These have been a positive experience for CHI. 3) Education dinner. Every year the tribe invites all the teachers to dinner on the reservation. 4) Special programs. Transitional K; alternative high school sponsored by CC - gives option for students with attendance problems; Indian Education Program is a good resource. 5) FAS and FAE. I am very worried about this. 6) Culture-free tests. It is a challenge to find measurements that are not culturally biased. Training for assessment staff would be helpful. 7) Cultural sensitivity. We need to be sensitive to cultural issues such as silence; indirect criticism; classroom atmosphere that respects Indian culture; small group instruction.
Special Ed. Teacher District 85	Optional workshop on NA learning styles 2 years ago. Well attended.		a) NA parents participate fully. c) Have not needed to make accommodations myself but there is a NA liaison that can provide transportation.	Health problems. NA children receive little medical attention. Unmet health needs are the biggest problem for Indian kids here.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

District 05 (cont.)

Informants	(8) Training of special education staff	(9) a) Special ed. eligibility based on professional judgement? b) Rationale.	(10) a) Parent participating in IEP? b) How frequent? c) Accomodations.	(11) Unique problems and solutions.
Tribal Educator District 05	None that I know of.	I have a problem with test scores in general. They may be biased. You want special help for these students but special education may not be the best way. Special education is an easy option. They are always eligible on the test. But our kids don't test well. They need to take other things into consideration.	c) Special education teacher used to come to the reservation.	1) Drop out. We don't have exact data but we know it is a problem. We track it informally and can't figure out where all these kids are going. Losing about 14-20 per year. 2) Relevance. The classes are not relevant or creative for special education. Only 2 or 3 special education kids go to the life skills program. The parent has to go ask for the program. 3) Counseling. We need counseling services. Schools refer to IHS. Need alternatives, especially for short-term crisis intervention. 4) Extended school year. Our kids are eligible, need it, and nobody's getting it. 5) Tutoring. Has really helped. Waiting list of 50-70 kids. Many special education students are referred. District makes small commitment: they give us space and they let us use the activity bus. 6) PAVE. We held a well attended PAVE training this year.
Parent/Teacher's Aide District 05	There is no training.	a) Very frequently. One time they wanted to put a student in special education because he couldn't jump rope and had poor fine motor skills. Once in special education, very difficult to get out. I knew one student on the honor roll with 4.0 and he can't get unlabelled.	If you participate it means that you just sit there and listen and go along with whatever they tell you.	1) Parent participation. They don't let the parents have a voice in the program. I went to school to ask for changes in my daughter's schedule. They wouldn't do it. They go out of their way to make you feel uncomfortable. I've never left an IEP conference feeling good. Parents don't attend meetings because they know that their concerns won't be heard. 2) Special education. Pull the kids out so much. They miss a lot. One son was in the same workbook for 3 years. Another son I refused to let be placed in special education. He's doing much better than the 2 who were in special education. When your kids are young they start right off telling you how low they are. 3) Drop outs. We have a drop out problem particularly among the special education students. Higher among Indians than among whites. Lots of "holding back" in elementary school. Kids held back are so much older than their classmates. 4) Creative solutions. For example, some kids would do best with just a half-day of school. My daughter needs 5 credits to graduate. The school won't let her go on a half-day basis or graduate early. 5) Childfind. There is no Childfind. I think I would not want it because then they could label kids special education even earlier.
Tutor District 05				1) Drop out rate. I think it has declined in recent years because of more mixing among Indian and non-Indian students. More Indians are participating in sports. This has made a big difference. Pow wows can cause some students to drop out because the celebrations are more important to parents than what non-Indians can teach their kids. 2) Attendance. This is a big problem. Sometimes it is related to alcohol and drug abuse. I encourage students to attend Al Anon or Alateen. These are wonderful programs. 3) Workshops. Fund raisers are held to support workshops on parenting, sex education, and math for parents wanting to help their children, at MMIC.

92

Informants	(8) Training for Special Education Staff	(9) a) Special Education Eligibility Based on Professional Judgment b) Rationale	(10) a) Parent Participation IEP b) How Frequent c) Accommodations	(11) Unique Problems & Solutions
Administrator District 86	No formal training. Seriously consider cultural sensitivity in hiring process. Utilize outside inservice. Informal sharing and training works well in small district like ours.	a) Rarely. We intervene prior to referral. Focus on prevention. b) Use checklist in LD Reg. Also use info obtained from working with the family. Compare child to peer group. We are committed to avoiding wholesale placement of NA in Spec. Ed. If we only looked at test scores, many would be automatically referred.	a) Not all, but it's increasing b) 10% fail to attend IEP c) NA staff contact parents, offer to go to them; priority is to make families feel comfortable	1) Committed to improvement. We seek continual growth to find and implement best practices. Difficult to obtain information. We don't fully understand the NA cultural norms and make mistakes (e.g., asking direct questions of parents re: adaptive behavior). 2) Obtaining knowledge is difficult. Do we need information specific to our district/ tribe, or is it more general?
Elementary Teacher District 86	Nothing formal. Ongoing dialogue between school board and tribal council (e.g., we raised concerns re: absences during pow wow). It has improved.	a) You develop a gut feeling. We look at adaptive behavior, cultural variables, get a picture of whole child. Survival skills are usually well-developed. Tribal members also provide info on child in social settings, family roles, etc.	c) IEPs are often rescheduled. It's flexible. Liaison assists parents. Parents passive, difficulty challenging a decision, they've had bad experiences in the past. Most meetings at school but some are on reservation. We provide transportation. Also get help from preschool on reservation. Limit size of meetings. Use standard English instead of jargon.	1) Team effort at elem. No excuses for NA students. We have high expectations. 2) Drop out rate high. Making curriculum changes. SD is concerned and active. Begin to lose students at middle school level. Get tough attitude in middle school compared to elementary. Limited post-school options on reservation and in the white world.
Preschool Teacher District 86	Encouraged to attend workshops and informal sharing. Resources seem adequate for preschool. Lots of parent contact, weekly team meetings. More input from NA parents than white parents	a) Try to avoid professional judgment. Only 1 case where child was so withdrawn he couldn't be tested. b) No formal rationale. MDT tries to find LRE. Look at how deficits will affect school performance, observe behavior patterns, compare adaptive behaviors, compare to peers.	a) Always involved, but don't always participate. They are very accepting. c) We go to reservation but encourage them to visit school. Parents have had negative experiences in the past. Those with older children are more comfortable coming to school. Communication problems due to no phones and disregarded mail. Try to make them feel comfortable.	1) Avoid special education stigma. Try to give kids strongest chance. Kindergarten teacher is special ed. endorsed and gives special language intervention as needed. 2) Birth-3 program. Not special education. Lots of parent involvement. Fewer problems in kindergarten. Now, NA kids who really have problems are found in kindergarten. 3) Transition to kindergarten. It is very good. Kindergarten teacher knows kids very well before they arrive. Even have half day transition period for language delayed. 4) Impact of Preschool. Doing follow-up of 0-3 graduates through school. 5) Optimism. I've seen changes in 5 years. More optimistic. Fewer behavior problems when kids arrive. Higher teacher expectations. 6) Parent Participation. Important to go to them. Use oral v. written language.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Informants	(8) Training for Special Education Staff	(9) a) Special Education Eligibility Based on Professional Judgment b) Rationale	(10) a) Parent Participation in IEP b) How Frequent c) Accomodations	(11) Unique Problems and Solutions
Parent District 86	No formal training. It would be helpful. Especially on NA culture, e.g., help explain absences for initiation rites and funerals.	Both son and daughter in special education. Daughter placed because son was placed. I worked to get daughter out. Special ed. very isolating before LRE.	ab) Not very involved. Only 1 or 2. Only if student is doing very poorly. Many parents afraid of school, distrust teachers, fear school staff will talk about their child. Feel threatened that child will be above them when educated. c) Staff go to the home. Parents need time to build trust. It is good that our staff is stable. More parents involved because of preschool, Head Start. Parents still terrified to come to school. Need liaison between school and reservation.	1) Education on culture. It would be helpful to have one of our elders explain our traditions, dances, funerals to staff. 2) Progress. I see program starting to work. NA students used to be left out of Christmas and Easter events and isolated in special ed. No life skills or voc. ed. training. Now we see more questioning of how NA students are doing in elementary and secondary programs. 3) Trust. Had to start with one another on the staff before students. 4) Mainstreaming. We have set a good example for other districts in mainstreaming NA students. Very important to mainstream so NA students can learn white ways. 5) Birth-3 program. This is good, needed because NA childrearing results in less social/verbal preschoolers than white children.
Counselor District 86		a) Focus of concern leads to careful examination of child (tests + other info) and review of many placement options besides special ed. MDT results in lots of options. Decisions are strongly academic. Certainly we use professional judgment in that we do everything we can to keep student in regular classroom.	a) It's improving. 0-3 program is helping. IEP is scary process c) We go to reservation. Often have to hound them.	1) Birth-3 program. Very positive. Shows willingness of NA to buy into the value of education programs. Located in prominent place on reservation. 2) Teen pregnancy, AIDS, birthrate. I worry about these; real problems for these students. 3) Trust. It's still a problem. Need to keep working toward common goals of helping the kids. Can't wipe out years of Indian/white man history. 4) Monthly meetings. School board/tribal senate. Discuss attendance, graduation, life skills, job training, etc. 5) NA represented on school board. Social service director and member of tribal senate on 5-member school board. 6) Reservation based programs. 0-3, Head Start, special ed. preschool, after school study hall, evening study hall. 7) Aides. NA aides employed by district. 8) Good staff. Excellent hiring practices 9) Alcohol and drug abuse. Problems here, FAS, FAE, Cocaine. 10) Transience. Could increase with new fishing grounds. 11) Community resource training. Lots of failure in high school. Have a program to get kids into community jobs. It's in the IEP. 12) High NA dropout. May be due to lack of voc. options. Absolutely requires parent cooperation.

Informants	(8) Training for Special Education Staff	(9) a) Special Education Eligibility Based on Professional Judgment b) Rationale	(10) a) Parent Participation in IEP b) How Frequent c) Accomodations	(11) Unique Problems and Solutions
Therapist District 86	MDT meets to discuss referrals	a) Cultural, environmental, and economic factors are always considered. Professional judgment is always involved. I know which items NA kids will fail and take this into account. b) State guidelines determine the tools we use.	ab) Percent is low. We really try to get them in. c) Transportation, reschedule meetings. No phones. Intrusive to go to home, but sometimes it is the only choice. Simplify forms for limited English reading.	1) Attendance. Has improved as a result of school and tribe working together.
Parent District 86	Not Asked	a) Teacher and special education director explained them to me at the time	a) A lot of parents don't make it to the conferences. That's why I didn't get anywhere. My parents never went to the meetings.	1) Teachers. Teachers tend to push but not encourage NA students 2) Cultural influences. My children's biggest problem is jealous relatives who are not in school and make it hard for my kids. 3) NA Teachers. I'd like to see NA teachers in the school. My kids used to learn (in Canada) about their culture and customs. The school is really okay except for lack of cultural education. 4) Special education. I didn't want my kids isolated in special education. They know 2 NA languages. English and math are difficult. 5) Parents. School does everything to encourage parents but the parents still don't participate. They need to remember they're not going to school to talk to the teachers, they're going to talk about their kids.
2 Tribal Representatives District 86		a) Tribal member was concerned about culturally biased tests. Arranged for Indian tester from Seattle. District is trying. No perfect instruments available; none normed on NA students, no culture-free measure.	a) Tribal Soc. Serv. Dir. is involved with IEPs, help in finding services. c) Tribal staff help explain procedures to parents	1) Great improvements in relationship with district. Tribe initiated contact. Tribal senate now meets with school board (4 years). School district has come a long way. 80-85% of teachers are making direct effort to better serve NA students. Two tribal members are on school board. 2) Hiring practices. Screen and recruit staff that will be culturally aware. Has hired tribal members in 10 staff positions. 3) Drop-outs. This is our biggest concern. Rate is going down. Class of '90 will be the biggest in 12 years. 4) Birth-3. Has helped a lot. Gets parents involved early. Based on reservation where it occupies central physical location. Started with 4 kids; now serving 40. Staff includes e.c. educator from school and tribe, tribe's nurse practitioner, SW, child welfare worker, social services director. Meet weekly with DSHS for case management. 5) Tribal leadership. The tribe got active in education (and land use) to make the community aware of us, to understand us, and to work together for our future.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Informants	(8) Training for Special Education Staff	(9) a) Special Education Eligibility Based on Professional Judgment b) Rationale	(10) a) Parent Participation in IEP b) How Frequent c) Accommodations	(11) Unique Problems and Solutions
Administrator District #7	Workshops MDT sent to nonbiased assessment workshop ESD workshop 2 years ago Big concern in district NA students come to school without language of instruction	a) Very infrequently (SBD is wishy washy), we under-refer and consider lack of parental supervision. b) MDT process at work. Involve RNs, IHS. Offer many ancillary services to preschool to reduce referrals.	a) 81 problem. At preschool, teacher goes to parents. 3 contact rule, then principal and special education director sign off. c) provide trans. - not requested often. Have parent activities at preschool (Burke Museum). Have In. Ed. Coord. now.	1) Drop-outs. Special alternative high school on reservation, Indian tutorials, 3 periods/day at H.S., voc. classes (Sno Isle and in-district), drop-out prevention staff jointly funded by SD and Tulalip (14 hours/week for secondary schools). 2) Cultural influences. Need leadership. Struggle against pull of reservation and white world. 3) SD Consistent. Have new Indian Ed. Specialist. Attrition in Jr. High. 4) Preschool. On reservation. Did language inservice. Indian before-school experience conflicts with school expectations. 5) Referral to S.E.. Pre-referral process documenting alternatives. 6) Language needs. District has tried to sustain special services for language delayed and at-risk preschoolers.
Tribal Educator District #7	Teachers hired by school district are not adequately trained (general comment - not specific to sp. ed.)	N.A.	Parent involvement disrupted by fishing season, seasonal cycles.	1) District alternatives are not working. Many alternatives. S.D. lock-step. Difficult to get new courses; district needs to consult tribe rather than make decision for it; district doesn't recognize culture. 2) Seasonal culture. Fishing season, in particular, governs activities (also berry picking, ceremonies). Alt. High School - Aug. Through Dec. (tripled in 5 years). 3) REACH. District is resisting; need to appreciate cultural diversity. 4) Tulalip Flee. SD sent in white kids to school near reservation. Did not consult tribe. Now tribe is minority again. 5) Pregnancies. High. Creates greater dependency. 6) Parenting Resources Needed. Help with parenting roles - TV instruction. 7) Not technologically literate. School not preparing Indians for tech. society (e.g., computer instruction).
Psychologist District #7	None, informal only. Need for inservice in NA culture.	a) Operate by the book - occasionally make exceptions. Use non-biased tests b) School history and attendance considered as environmental factors	a) Parents asked to suggest goals. Parent involvement is less with NA parents. Invest most time in initial IEP (home visits); for updated IEPs, after 3 attempts at meeting, IEP is mailed.	1) Attendance. Big problem. Have PTA involved in providing awards. Biggest problem in K-1, where attendance is undervalued by parents. 2) Non-biased assess. instruments. State needs to table more for use with minorities.

Informants	(8) Training for Special Education Staff	(9) a) Special Education Eligibility Based on Professional Judgment b) Rationale	(10) a) Parent Involvement in IEP b) How Frequent c) Accommodations	(11) Unique Problems and Solutions
Preschool Teacher District 87	Training is general. Nothing special re: NA children	a) Adhere to the law	c) She works to explain process to parents. Sends out flyers for Friday workshops. Leave parts of IEP for them to complete. Letters, scheduled phone calls, transportation, NA liaison.	1) Parent involvement. Many parents quite dysfunctional. I educate them about their rights; have NA liaison; have parent involvement field trips. Very poor participation. 2) Trust. Parents don't trust the white teachers. Also don't understand the benefits of preschool. Good to reduce teacher turnover to build/maintain trust. Parents very suspicious when child is first identified. After program they are pleased with progress. 3) Transition. If 6-year-olds don't meet eligibility for special education, no special services in first grade. Need to track them for 1 year after preschool. 4) Liaison. Big impact - catalyst to home/school interaction. 5) Cultural issues. Dental care needed; eye contact less common in NA culture. Foster care requires NA placements but insufficient NA homes.
Therapist District 87	No training. In-district resources like NA specialist; also IHS audiologist.	a) Infrequently. One case where child was non-verbal, parents verbal, wanted help. I look at whether language skills match overall abilities. Give SCID, Peabody, EOWVI compared to lang. sample for 3-year-olds. Four-year-olds get PPVI, EOWVI, TELD, lang. sample. First and second grade use Boehm, Auditory Pointing, and TOLD-P. I would like to use developmental checklist to obtain profile of skills. b) Directive from OSPI, however you can't rule out environmental factors.	a) Pretty minimal. b) I have never been at an IEP without a parent present. c) We have 2 liaisons, provide transportation. Repeated attempts to contact.	1) Transition. Informal practices. Tribal preschool teachers observe in kindergarten class. Bring students. Kindergarten aide is NA. Send to developmental kindergarten if not ready for kindergarten. 2) Distrust. Great walls of distrust need to be knocked down. Dissension in tribe between traditional values and desire for kids to be successful in school. 3) Cultural Differences. No eye contact, non-verbal. Parents don't always accept preschool. We have misinterpreted NA children's behavior: they come to school with low language.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Informants	(8) Training for Special Education Staff	(9) a) Special Education Eligibility Based on Professional Judgment b) Rationale	(10) a) Parent Participation in IEP b) How Frequent c) Accomodations	(11) Unique Problems and Solutions
Administrator District 87	No special training. No formal coordination between Indian Ed. & Special Ed.	Standardized tests are used and eliminate the role of subjective judgment.	b) No problems with IEPs c) No special accomodations that I am aware of.	1) Relations between the tribe and the school district. Parents don't respond to requests from SD. Rooted in local history of racial conflict. All parents have gone through district and have had bad experiences. Resisting REACH training. 2) Middle school. At Elem. 50-60% NA; then they go to MS with only 6% NA. 3) Drop outs. Alternative high school helps some. Still 85% dropout rate at Alt. school. 4) Indian liaison at M.S.. Has helped + M.S. multicultural program 1 a year. M.S. counselor meets with 5th graders to help transition. 5) Tutorial. Program with cert. teachers at M.S. and H.S. 6) Parent involvement. Major concern to tribe as it relates to attendance and achievement. SD has parent involvement specialists - teaches values. Also have: school liaisons, transportation, other resources.

Informants	(8) Training for Special Education Staff	(9) a) Special Education Eligibility Based on Professional Judgeent b) Rationale	(10) a) Parent Participation in IEP b) How Frequent c) Accoeeodations	(11) Unique Probleas and Solutions
Adainistrator District 08	No special training right now. Group of CDS and Psychs went to the ESD 189 training. NA students living in the coeeunity and are not always recognized. Our staff are aware of surnaaes. We are careful to ask the right questions to assure appropriate placeeents. Our CDSs aeet biweekly to discuss these cases. Also aware of language patterns of NA.	a) Frequently. I would guess 50% of the tiae professional judgeent coaes into play along with test scores. b) We look at siblings not in spec. ed. or look at the child's school history. Both principals and psychologists are very good about recognizing the iaportance of cultural factors. Also encourage parent involveeent.	a) They do attend b) 80% if not all parents attend c) District expends a lot of effort to see the parent. Letters, phone calls, follow-up, and even go to the hoae. Teachers go to hoaes. Once child in spec. ed. and parent understands the iaportance, they attend as frequently as other parents	1) Attendance. It is low. 2) Parent involveeent. This is a probleo 3) Drop out. We have a probleo deteraining the size of our drop out probleo. We think soae of our students aay be attending tribal school. 4) Behavior. Students froa faailies that are tied to the reservation are alienated, isolated. 5) JOM. Prograas have helped.
Tutor District 08	No special training. Staff need to be aware of NA culture and substance abuse aaong faailies	Many are referred but few are found eligible. There are only 2 students in spec. ed. at H.S. out of 40-50 NA students.	a) Yes c) Soaetiaes tutors are asked to go to the hoae.	1) Substance abuse. We have a real probleo with dysfunctional faailies. 85% of the reservation faailies have substance abuse probleas. 2) High drop out rate 3) Off-reservation. Students froa reservation look down on those that live off the reservation. 4) Tutor-counselor prograa. This has been very helpful. We provide a role aodel. Also advisor for youth group, chaperone, retreats. Lots of support at superintendent level for NA students.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Informants	(8) Training for Special Education Staff	(9) a) Special Education Eligibility Based on Professional Judgment b) Rationale	(10) a) Parent Participation in IEP b) How Frequent c) Accomodations	(11) Unique Problems and Solutions
Administrator District 89	No formal training	a) Very rare. b) Formal rationale in that spec. ed. laws state that culture can not be a factor in determining eligibility. If child is not surviving in school due to cultural or environmental factors we have LAP and CHI.	a) Yes, if we can get them there c) Transportation	1) Poverty 2) Transportation 3) Drugs and Alcohol 4) Political climate. Difficult for tribe and district to be unified. Preschool is helping to improve our relationship. Relationship goes up and down. 5) Communication. We don't speak the same language. They misunderstand us. Our letters are misinterpreted. We reserved a special board meeting for tribal reps and no one attended. Need to build trust.
Administrator District 89	In college and through inservice. District does not offer anything special.	a) Professional judgment isn't used with NA any more than with other students - 5-10% of the time. If student is in-between, we go ahead and serve them.	a) Depends on the parent. Can't typify NA parents as being less involved.	1) Drop outs. It's about 25-30%. Our numbers are very small. We lost one this year. We worked hard to keep her. She violated the conduct rules. We can't make exceptions. Four years ago the drop out rate was more like 75%. 2) Vocational education. NA access same voc. ed. offerings as others. Some students go to Sno-Isle Skill Center, including 1 NA student. 100% participation in voc. ed. 3) Feud. There is a feud between 2 families on the reservation that affects the schools. 4) Seeing more success. We now have high school students that started out in school as young children. Next year we will have 2 graduates.
Parent/Teacher's Aide District 89			One or 2 parents are involved (6 children in program). Program just started. Parent program on Thursdays.	1) Smaller. Size of district is improvement over larger district. Good teacher. My kids like school, want to go to school.
Teacher's Aide District 89	a) Workshops like the one on the Swinomish reservation.	a) Must meet WAC guidelines. b) Cultural factors are considered. Borderline children receive remedial work or an opportunity to practice for a test.	a) Don't know. b) Families at tribal preschool have been available fairly readily.	1) Getting children to school. I have knocked on doors. It gets easier. Attendance is pretty good for my students.

Interviewee	(III) Training for Special Education Staff	(IV) a) Special Education Eligibility Based on Professional Judgement b) Rationale	(V) a) Parent Participation in IEP b) How Frequent c) Accomodations	(VI) Unique Problems and Solutions
Elementary Spec. Ed. Teacher District #9	Three years ago we had a 6 week class on NA learning styles in Arlington. I use curriculum-based assessment to help determine resources and problems. Meets needs with less bias.	a) We really try <u>not</u> to classify kids as spec. ed. We classify kids as communication disordered or language delayed rather than LD. We can serve them but don't have to label them. b) No formal rationale. We look at performance in class, the need for services. Each case is individual. I see a need for a more formalized approach.	a) About 90% participate. I don't think they understand, however. Participation after IEP is signed is low. Only come 1 x year for IEP c) Have tried meeting in homes but this is more uncomfortable. Now we have a ride system. Set up convenient times to allow for carpooling. We always are available to reschedule. Subsequent contact is done with letters and is not successful.	1) <u>K-3 no problem</u>. Kids blend in. We work with them in small groups. 2) <u>Grade 4-6 harder to motivate</u>. Pulling out draws attention. By 5th grade they stop participating socially. 3) <u>Parents</u>. It's hard to get them to school. 4) <u>Relations with reservation</u>. Closer in past. Our key contacts on reservation have changed. New reservation and political structure is still forming. Preschool is an exciting precedent. 5) <u>Reduced NA spec. ed. population</u>. We classify them as language delayed or communication disordered and still provide service. 6) <u>Drop outs</u>. High drop out rate. Families are transient. Students go back and forth between 2 reservations.
Preschool Teacher District #9	We have a number of programs: ERIN, #6 program in Snohomish Co, Parenting as Prevention (sent by tribe), 2 aides to CDA at NWIC. I have degree in anthropology and studied NA culture.	a) Frequently. NA children have language and speech problems, from learning deficits and cultural differences. IHS no longer provides tubes for middle ear infections. Higher incidence among NA. (Note: IHS said no policy change has been made. Tubes are up to individual practitioners. Payment requires a referral by local tribe.)	a) Yes. c) I try to insure that the assessment process is not threatening.	1) <u>Cultural differences</u>. Like time. NA are non-linear, non-verbal, non-sequential. They see the whole. They are also suspicious (e.g., blankets) due to history with whites. 2) <u>Childfind</u>. Have not done a complete childfind. 3) <u>Attendance</u>. This is a problem because of pow wow. These ceremonies are very important. Teachers don't appreciate the reasons for absences during pow wow. 4) <u>Drinking</u>. It is easy for whites to condemn NA. I am aware of the research on difference in metabolism, the genetic basis for low tolerance. I am also concerned that we will not be able to serve the FAS, FAE, and drug-affected children. 5) <u>Dependence</u>. The NA are dependent people. They have not been independent since treaty days. We have made them depend on white govt for basic needs. 6) <u>Obstacles</u>. NA parents hear their children being written off. School does not provide noon transportation for half-day kindergarten. Leads to poor attendance in kindergarten. Children were retained for missing school. Now preschool has van to use to pick up kindergartners. 7) <u>Cultural awareness</u>. Children are looked down upon. Teachers not aware of culture and environment. One teacher thought tribes on west side of Cascades live in teepees. 8) <u>Communication</u>. District gave tribal leadership the impression that their children were too smart for the new preschool. I had to go explain that [illegible] was for all of the NC children.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Informants	(8) Training of Special Education Staff	(9) a) Special Education Eligibility Based on Professional Judgment b) Rationale	(10) a) Parent Participating in IEP b) How Frequent c) Accommodations	(11) Unique Problems and Solutions
Counselor District 89	Should have received some as undergrads. I have attended conferences along with elementary and spec. ed. staff.	a) Infrequently. Use MDT b) Consideration given to cultural background. Our psychologist is good at this.	a) Yes, they do attend. They are frequently afraid of school. Our 1 spec. ed. student's parents did not attend. c) In elementary school, teacher goes to reservation. Transportation didn't work very well.	1) Excluding students. Teachers will unknowingly exclude NA students. They are not competitive and will drop out rather than participate. 2) Role models. Having good NA role models is a big help. Involvement in athletics has helped. 3) Drop outs. In 3 years, we have had 2 of 12 drop out. Some transfer to other schools. Both drop outs returned. They had drug and alcohol problems. If we can get the kids past 6th grade, we'll get them to 9th. We have 40 in elementary. I don't know where the others are going. 4) More mixing. We are getting NA students involved in FHA, clubs, sports. I see more mixing. Being a small district helps. 5) Communication with parents. This is difficult. Written communication doesn't work. You almost have to go out to the reservation. They are intimidated when they come here. More and more parents are coming to the elementary school. We need a NA elementary teacher. At middle/high school we have 1 teacher who is half NA.

Informants	(1) a) Tests for dominant language? b) Bilingual screening? c) Given by professional fluent in child's language?	(2) Tests for special ed. placement to establish language competency given in both languages?	(3) a) Interpreter to screen/ assess? b) Training for interpreters? c) Interpreter literate?	(4) a) Informed consent from non-English speaking parents? b) Due process forms mailed? c) Similar for migrant & NA?	(5) Assessment for preschool LEP special ed. candidates?	(6) Place LEP students in special ed. due to lack of other options?
Migrant Educator, Regional	a) LAS-Qualifies student for 3 years. b) LAS c) Trained aide but it varies from district to district. Sometimes use a CDS or whoever is available.	No. Use SOMPA in English. Have ordered it in Spanish. Normed in Mexico City. Kauffman - non-verbal.	a) Use migrant aides, migrant home visitors, & migrant resource teacher. b) Yes. c) No. Only Spanish-speaking in many cases.	a) Just now getting forms translated into Spanish. Send migrant home visitor to home to obtain consent. (Some don't write or read Spanish.) In one district, won't assess if child does not speak English. Won't assess unless they get permission but some parents sign-off without knowing what's going on.	Don't know. Don't think LEP students are involved in the 2 preschool programs in the region.	Yes. I was appalled at the number of LEP students in special ed. Teachers keep referring instead of following intervention prescribed by migrant program. Some kids are weak in both languages and need bilingual program.
Migrant Educators, Regional	a) The LAS, BINL, 1 or 2 others. LAS used often because it can qualify students for bilingual funding. b) LAS c) Sometimes by Resource Teacher or trained bilingual aide. Sometimes by aides who are not adequately trained, especially in scoring.	No.	a) Some do. Some do not have staff to interpret or translate. If they have a bilingual program, then they have staff to do it.	a) Sometimes letters, hopefully translated. Migrant Resource teachers may be asked to go to the home to obtain consent for Special Education testing or placement. Occasionally, migrant home visitors (aides) are sent out with the forms to get parents to sign. Not trained in special education. b) Yes. In English.	Don't know for sure. Easy to confuse LEP with handicapping condition.	Yes, often. Some administrators don't feel that they have any other options to offer. Also a political issue. Many special education staff realize what the students need but it is difficult to accomplish in that alternatives don't exist.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Informants	(7) Reporting migrant students to special education?	(8) Training of special education staff.	(9) a) Special ed. eligibility based on professional judgement? b) Rationale.	(10) a) Parent participating in IEP? b) How frequent? c) Accommodations.	(11) Unique problems and solutions.
Migrant Educator, (cont.)	Yes, I think so. We also report them on Migrant Student Record Forms.	None. One school psychologist has had some but the teachers haven't had any.	a) I'm not sure but I think it happens too often. I see migrant students in special ed. resource rooms without assessments.	a) Yes, parents do participate in the IEP. Migrant home visitor serves as the interpreter even though she may not be literate in Spanish.	1) Awareness. Lack of awareness of multicultural and bilingual issues among teachers and administrators. Lack of commitment, lack of funds. 2) Inappropriate methods. Basic ed., CHI, and special ed. are not being adapted to meet the needs of LEP students. Supplemental tutoring turns out to be their basic education. 3) Level of support. Lack of services & state & federal support. $500/child incents qualification but not service. 4) Parent involvement. Parents are not made to feel comfortable in schools. No bilingual staff. Registration forms only in English. 5) Preschool transition. We don't know who is coming before they get here. 6) Drop-outs. Migrant students are dropping out. No bilingual support in most cases: just a migrant aide. One district did not apply for migrant funds. For students who do graduate, little help with post-secondary programs. 7) Trained staff. Need certified bilingual teachers in each district. Need to commit basic ed. funds to bilingual programs. 8) Discrimination. The truth hurts but we need to face it and change because the kids won't succeed. Problem is being dealt with by denial and hope that kids will move elsewhere.
Migrant Educators, Regional	Sometimes the home visitors go to the child's home and find out that the child has been in special education.	Not sure. Have found that district staff are aware of the frequency of inappropriate placements of migrant students in special education.	Don't know.	a) Varies greatly. Have seen staffing and placements done without parents. Parents don't realize that children are being placed in special ed as we know it; they think it is just special help. The parents need to work during the day and can't come to school. c) Sometimes migrant home visitor or teacher is sent out to bring parents in. Districts don't usually have evening meetings or home visits.	1) Appropriate services. Once identified and placed, there are no appropriate programs. Special ed programs offered are not appropriate for bilingual and LEP students. Special ed teaching techniques are very good, but students need instruction in basic skills taught in Spanish. Nice to have services without the label. 2) Bilingual classrooms. To identify and place appropriately, need a team to decide if child has a handicapping condition or if LEP. Team should represent special ed, bilingual, and ESL. Bilingual classroom would be a good place to observe child. After a time of observing child, easier to decide if he needs special ed or if his educational deficits are the result of the language difference. 3) No basic education funds. Migrant programs are supplemental yet this is the only appropriate service bilingual students receive. Districts do not commit basic ed funds for appropriate services. 4) Staffing. Trained staff for assessment and instruction are not in all districts. When bilingual staff are present, their expertise may not be used in regular classroom. 5) Drop-outs. Very high. Students placed inappropriately in special ed are aware that they don't belong. If retained for one year, 50% chance of dropping out; if retained for two years, 95% chance of dropping out.

Informants	(8) Training of special education staff.	(9) a) Special ed. eligibility based on professional judgement? b) Rationale.	(10) a) Parent participating in IEP? b) How frequent? c) Accomodations.	(11) Unique problems and solutions.
Tribal Educator Regional	None. Need more inservice on tribal education. Special ed. could use more paraprofessional/liaisons.	a) Many school psychologists seem to feel it is important not to label Indian children. b) I am not sure of the rationale. Fear of the unknown. Dollars are an issue in special ed.	c) I recommend that accomodations be made through the Title VI paraprofessionals. If people don't know about a culture they should always ask and never make assumptions.	1) Communication. The key to success is communication between tribes and school districts. 2) Drop-outs. Majority are dropping out. With pregnant mothers about 50% drop out. 3) Alternative high schools on reservation. It is a viable alternative because it gives them support. So many Indian adolescents come from dysfunctional families. 4) Preschool. Must begin early and address needs of family and child. Parents not aware of services available. Need programs for non-special ed. "at risk" children, too. 5) Need certified alcohol counselors. MW Indian College is training these. 6) Parenting as Prevention Program. Provides historical perspective on the impact of policies like boarding schools and the resulting dysfunctional families. This historical aspect is important for those educating Indian students.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE